



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 16, 2013

No. 51

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, the explosions at the Boston Marathon remind us that we live in a dangerous world and that human life, regardless of the level of physical excellence, is fragile. The knowledge that You, O God, can bring order from chaos inspires us to number our days so that we may have hearts of wisdom. Use our lawmakers as instruments of Your Providence. May they labor with such faithfulness and integrity that You will surround them and our Nation with the shield of Your favor. Remind them that it is better to fail in a cause that will ultimately succeed than to succeed in a cause that will ultimately fail.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following any leader remarks the Senate will be in a period of morning business for an hour. The majority will control the first half, the Republicans the final half.

Following morning business the Senate will resume consideration of the

Safe Communities, Safe Schools Act, with the time until the recess for the caucus meetings for debate only.

The Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

Today we will continue to work on a path forward to consider amendments to the gun safety bill. Currently, the Manchin-Toomey amendment on background checks is pending to the bill. Senators will be notified when any votes are scheduled.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 729 AND S. 730

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading. I would ask, if it is appropriate, for the clerk to report whatever the Chair advises.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the titles of the bills for a second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 729) to protect law abiding citizens by preventing criminals from obtaining firearms.

A bill (S. 730) to prevent criminals from obtaining firearms through straw purchasing and trafficking.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would object to any further proceedings on these two bills at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

BOSTON MARATHON VIOLENCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in the prayer given to the American people and to

the Senate through our wonderful Chaplain, he basically said it all. We are still reeling from the senseless violence at the Boston Marathon yesterday. The one thing, though, we are united in is sympathy for the victims of this senseless attack and the families of the victims who are suffering today.

Adding to the horror of this tragedy are the questions of who did this and why. The Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Homeland Security are investigating this attack as aggressively as possible.

As the President said last night, rest assured that the perpetrators will feel the full weight of justice for this terrible crime.

ANTI-GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on the anti-gun violence legislation before the Senate, we are making good progress in the effort to schedule a series of votes on amendments.

I have had constructive conversations with my Republican counterpart, Senator MCCONNELL.

The American people deserve to know where we stand on these important antiviolence proposals. There are disagreements as to what we should do with gun legislation, if anything, and I understand that. We have already spent a week and a half on this legislation, so it is time to begin processing these amendments.

I hope we will be able to reach an agreement earlier rather than later—hopefully, sometime by early afternoon—to hold votes on a number of amendments, including both Democratic and Republican amendments.

That series of votes would include a number of issues, not the least of which is the compromise background check proposal crafted by Senators MANCHIN, TOOMEY, KIRK, and SCHUMER. This bipartisan measure has the support of antiviolence advocates and law

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2657

enforcement groups as well as second amendment advocates, including the second largest gun rights group that exists, consisting of more than 650,000 members.

The measure would keep guns out of the hands of dangerous criminals by requiring background checks for private gun sales at gun shows and over the Internet.

Mr. President, whether you are from a pro-gun State such as Vermont or Nevada—even in those States, huge amounts, huge numbers of people support this legislation. Nationwide, about 90 percent of the people support this legislation, including 75 percent of NRA members.

So I am optimistic and hopeful that cooperation from both sides will continue and that victims of gun violence will get the debate and votes they deserve, including pro-gun advocates who want votes of their own liking.

So I hope we can move forward. It would be a shame if we got into a procedural hassle on all this stuff. We want to debate the issues. And as I have indicated to the Republican leader, we are not trying to cut off amendments. The ones we agree to start debating, that is not a limit as to what we are going to do. I want to have a full, complete debate on guns, and we will carry this on just as long as possible.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

BOSTON MARATHON ATTACKS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today the thoughts of every American are with the people of Boston but especially with the many victims of yesterday's horrendous attacks and their families.

Many who were looking forward to celebrating the achievement of a loved one yesterday woke up to the grim reality of facing the rest of their lives with a disfiguring injury. For them, yesterday's attacks were the beginning of a long and difficult journey. Three others who lined up to encourage others, including an 8-year-old boy who was there to cheer on his dad at the finish line, lost their lives in the blast.

We pray in a special way for these families.

As the President said yesterday, the two parties stand united today in our deepest sympathy for all those who were affected firsthand by these heinous attacks and in our unshakable—unshakable—resolve to bring those responsible, and any others who are contemplating acts like this, to justice.

These horrific attacks are a grim reminder of the hatred and contempt that many continue to harbor in their hearts not only for our Nation and its freedoms but for innocent human life. On 9/11 we were forever disabused of the

notion that attacks like the one that rocked Boston yesterday only happen on the field of battle or in distant countries. With the passage of time, however, and the vigilant efforts of our military, intelligence, and law enforcement professionals, I think it is safe to say for many the complacency that prevailed prior to September 11 has actually returned. So we are newly reminded that serious threats to our way of life remain.

Today, again, we recommit ourselves to the fight against terrorism at home and abroad.

Another point: As always, we marvel at the courage and the selflessness of those who rushed to the scene after yesterday's blasts. In moments like this, we see the worst of humanity and the best of our fellow citizens: whether it was the exhausted marathoners who became helpers and healers the moment they realized what had happened; the doctors and nurses who had expected the usual marathon day uptick in cases of dehydration or exhaustion but who spent the rest of their day handling far worse; or the first responders and law enforcement officials who rushed to the scene with total disregard for their own safety, including those who tore down a fence to get to the wounded before they were even sure the area was safe.

We honor all of them today.

Those responsible for this act of terror will be brought to justice for their deeds. But today our thoughts are mainly with the victims, their families, and friends—and all those whose lives have suddenly been turned upside down by the wicked designs of those responsible. For most of us, it is hard to imagine how anyone could even contemplate doing something like this. But, as always, as a nation, we will face this sad reality head on and show the world that America does not cower in the face of it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half.

The Senator from Maryland.

LIBRARY PROJECT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, Baltimore, like many other major cities, has struggled to educate its children. Recent statistics indicate that the

number of third graders reading below grade level in Baltimore is double the State average. This is especially troubling in light of the numerous national studies showing that for every six students who are not reading proficiently by third grade, one will not graduate.

Across the United States, research has shown that students in schools with good school libraries learn more, get better grades, and score higher on standardized tests than their peers in schools without libraries.

We have a program, the qualified zone academy bonds, that is available to help school districts in areas such as improving their libraries. Since 2001 Baltimore City has used those funds. Recently we extended the program through 2013. Academy bonds are important, but much more needs to be done to help our students.

Let me share with my colleagues a wonderful initiative, the Baltimore Elementary and Middle School Library Project, which is leveraging academy bonds and bringing in additional partners to maximize the resources available for hard-pressed schools and students. The Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation is spearheading this initiative. The Weinberg Foundation is one of the largest private charitable foundations in the United States. The Weinberg Foundation provides approximately \$100 million each year to nonprofits that provide direct services to low-income and vulnerable individuals and families, primarily in the United States and Israel. Since 1990 the foundation has made grants totaling \$1.6 billion—that is billion with a “b.”

The foundation was created by Harry Weinberg. His family emigrated from Eastern Europe to the United States in 1911. Harry Weinberg began his life in poverty, but he eventually built a transportation empire which extended into real estate. The fortune Harry Weinberg amassed now has grown to more than \$2 billion. These are the assets behind the Weinberg Foundation's grant-making.

Senator MIKULSKI and I are very proud that the Weinberg Foundation is based in our Baltimore City. I knew Harry Weinberg. I know the Weinberg family. I am very fortunate to have that relationship. The foundation has helped so many people, particularly in affordable housing, immigrant services, poverty issues, and humanitarian needs.

I would like to acknowledge the role my former State director, Bailey Fine, has played with the Weinberg Foundation.

I could list dozens of major charitable projects and initiatives that bear the name of the Weinberg Foundation, including a \$10-million grant to fund emergency services for Holocaust survivors in North America; a \$9.6 million commitment to make Maryland a model for care of lower income, older adults; a \$3 million investment in affordable housing for persons with disabilities, which includes a joint venture with the State of Maryland—the

first of its kind in the Nation. The Weinberg Foundation also has stepped up in times of global crisis, providing millions of dollars of relief grants in the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Sandy and emergency funding for humanitarian efforts following the Haiti earthquake in 2010 and the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2004.

In 2011 the Weinberg Foundation joined forces with a group of innovative and committed individuals to initiate a simple vision: transform Baltimore City school libraries to create larger, lasting change by increasing literacy rates and inspiring students. Words such as “partnership” and “collaboration” are often overused, but these concepts are central to the library project, a real-world demonstration of the power of combining resources directed toward a common goal.

To date, with the help of more than 30 government, nongovernment, and community partners and individuals, many who have traveled to Washington today, the library project has gone far beyond a simple makeover by creating completely transformed, well-designed, well-equipped spaces that send a simple but powerful message to young students in Baltimore City: They deserve the best. The Weinberg Foundation and its partners believe this manuscript for meaningful change can be applied to any city where people from nonprofits and public and private entities are willing to focus on a plan and then roll up their sleeves to make it happen.

The first of these refurbished libraries was dedicated in the fall of 2012. I was privileged to be able to visit and see firsthand how impressive this refurbished library is. Three more are scheduled to open this fall, with a total of 12 planned through 2015. The Weinberg Foundation has supported 30 percent of the capital project cost, is providing 4 years of additional staff support and professional development funds for the library. The Weinberg Foundation's support also goes to fund new books, up to 4,000 per space. Overall, the foundation has made a \$5 million, 4-year commitment to this initiative, and the children of Baltimore will benefit.

Each transformed library features thousands of new books and the latest in learning technology, including new computers and e-readers. As you can see from the photo I have brought to the floor, these are very impressive spaces and really go a long way to making them friendly places for students.

In addition to the direct educational benefits of these new spaces, one of the goals of the library project is to help each transformed library become a hub for greater school community. Because the Weinberg Foundation wants this project to be a successful model for years to come, it has partnered with the Baltimore Education Research Consortium to evaluate the impact of this space within the school community. Evaluations are underway at the

first three libraries and involve students, teachers, and community members.

In addition to supplying books as part of each renovation, the Weinberg Foundation and its partners wanted to do even more to equip these new spaces with the gift and adventure of reading. As part of the first year of the library project, the foundation launched a huge book drive with more than 40 partners and 100 pickup locations. It was clear that my fellow Marylanders were eager to contribute directly to this project, donating some 13,000 books valued at over \$75,000.

I share the story with my colleagues and the rest of the country because, just like a favorite book, it should be shared. The library project goes beyond funding, blueprints, bright new designs, and even state-of-the-art learning technologies. These libraries will improve reading and learning opportunities for countless children, helping to break the grinding cycle of poverty by providing young people with the hope and the tools for success in life.

As I said, this is a story that needs to be shared. The devoted officers and staff of the Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation and all the other participants in the library project would welcome the opportunity to tell this marvelous tale over and over and see it duplicated across the country.

Time constraints prevent me from talking about all of the partners in the library project. I mentioned the Federal partners, and I have highlighted the Weinberg Foundation's lead role, but everyone involved deserves recognition and our heartfelt thanks.

I ask unanimous consent that the list of the other partners and the descriptions of their contributions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL/STATE FUNDING

In 2001, Baltimore City Public Schools began applying for Qualified Zone Academy Bond (QZAB) funds that are used for the renovation of public school libraries. The QZAB funds renovate the physical space at each location and ensure proper configuration, environmental abatement, quality air control, lighting, and flooring for a few approved libraries each year. To qualify for QZAB funds, the school must be located in either an Empowerment Zone or Enterprise Community with 35% or more of its students eligible for the free or reduced price meal program.

As of 2011, 53 City School libraries have been renovated with \$14.2 million in QZAB funds and with more than \$2.5 million of donated in-kind volunteer hours. City Schools have also contributed an additional \$8.5 million for architectural/mechanical work, construction costs and furniture. The Baltimore Elementary and Middle School Library Project has leveraged these funds and brought in additional partners to maximize additional resources for schools and students.

BALTIMORE CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

As a partner in the Library Project, the district is providing guidance and academic

and facilities support in the creation of new and newly renovated school libraries that will contribute to 21st-century learning and position students for success.

ANNIE E. CASEY FOUNDATION

Advisory Committee Member.

ART WITH A HEART

For the Library Project, Art with a Heart will work with volunteers to create a mosaic for each of the three schools. All of the mosaics will incorporate the Library Project logo, however, each mosaic will be personalized to reflect the individual school community.

ASSOCIATION OF BALTIMORE AREA GRANTMAKERS

ABAG will publicize the library effort to ABAG members, particularly the Education Funders Affinity Group, through ABAG's monthly Members' Memo, website, and social media. ABAG will write a Daily Record article, and will be helpful in other ways identified over the life of the initiative.

BALTIMORE COMMUNITY FOUNDATION

The Baltimore Community Foundation encourages its donors to participate in the Library Project, which fits into BCF's overall vision for successful schools and successful students. The Library Project is a prime example of how a foundation can attract private sector partners to address a public need, inviting businesses and individuals to find ways to join together in promising Baltimore's youth a brighter future.

BALTIMORE EDUCATION RESEARCH CONSORTIUM (BERC)

In relation to the Baltimore Library Project, BERC will examine the change experienced at the first three library openings at Moravia Park Elementary, Southwest Baltimore Charter, and Thomas Johnson Elementary/Middle School.

BALTIMORE READS

Baltimore Reads assures that teachers have classroom libraries and that students receive books that they may take home. The Library Project complements the work of the Baltimore Reads' Book Bank, which collects and redistributes children's books all over the Baltimore region at no cost to recipients.

BALTIMORE SUN

The Baltimore Sun commitment at this time will be to deliver 25 papers each day (M-F) to each of the first six schools. The value of the papers for a year at full retail price is \$11,700, a total of \$70,200 for all six schools!

BARNES AND NOBLE

Barnes and Noble will provide 400 Nook digital devices and Certified Pre-Owned Nook digital devices, at special discounted prices for this project. Barnes and Noble will donate up to 20 hours of student and teacher training per month to ensure that every user is comfortable with the technology.

BOGDAN COMPUTER SERVICES

Bogdan Computer Services was responsible for the design and implementation of the Baltimore Library Project website. Its staff has also been a tremendous asset in technology purchases and book drive donations.

COMCAST

Previously Comcast has offered in-studio and on location filming and interviews which will be aired on CNN Headline News. This sponsorship package was valued at nearly \$100,000. Comcast will continue to review additional ways to sponsor the Library Project.

CPS GUMPART

Partners in the Weinberg Library Project through the graphic design and printing of event signage, promotional products, and

printed materials. We look forward to participating in the program as it continues to grow.

DLA PIPER

Financial donation.

DYSLEXIA TUTORING PROGRAM

The mission of The Dyslexia Tutoring Program is to provide free screening and remedial tutoring for low-income adults and children throughout Maryland with dyslexia and other language based learning differences. Volunteers take a free 20-hr training course in preparation for tutoring. The program works to achieve the following: (1) Train teachers in Orton-Gillingham, a proven method of teaching reading, writing and spelling; (2) Tutor students that are accepted into our program by providing free tutoring; (3) Provide In-Service Workshops to school staff to help identify potential students.

ENOCH PRATT FREE LIBRARY

The Enoch Pratt Free Library will be a major partner in the library project. Each elementary school library will include an "Enoch Pratt Parent Corner" with a computer connecting parents to the Enoch Pratt system. In addition, each library will have a permanent loan collection on parenting books and other appropriate adult literature. Enoch Pratt will also provide four Family Reading Circle programs during the school year. This six-week program brings a library professional to the school, with high-quality books and dinner for the group. Enoch Pratt will also provide limited funding for students to take public transportation from their homes or from school to the closest Pratt Library. Finally, Enoch Pratt Free Library will host students from each school for field trips to the central library each year. The estimated value of this partnership is \$20,000 per library, or \$80,000 for the first four libraries.

FUND FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE

The Fund for Educational Excellence has worked side by side with Baltimore City Public Schools for over 25 years securing the financial, human, and knowledge resources necessary to support policy and practice resulting in increased student achievement for Baltimore City Public School students. On this project the Fund serves as the fiscal agent working as an intermediary between City Schools and the Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation to ensure all grant dollars are allocated to the project appropriately.

HEART OF AMERICA FOUNDATION

HOA will coordinate the purchasing, sorting, cataloging and delivery of brand new library books for each school. In addition, to address the fact that as many as 61 percent of children from low income families do not have any books in the home, HOA will provide three books per student for his or her home library. This year, HOA will deliver more than 9,800 library books in total and over 4,800 take home books for the students for this project.

INCITE CREATIVE

The firm's focus group facilitation with students and their parents helped guide their design and development of the Library Project's logo and overall identity.

JRS ARCHITECTS, INC

JRS Architects, Inc., as a consultant to Baltimore City Public Schools, will work closely with Kirk Designs to incorporate the elements of the concept plan into the architectural plans, including coordination of proposed lighting and technology with electrical and data plans, incorporation of floor, wall and window treatments into the construction documents. JRS Architects will

also help coordinate the efforts of other partners donating technology and equipment to ensure smooth coordination into the finished library. JRS Architects, Inc. will be donating the time required to coordinate the efforts of the partners in the three QZAB-funded projects.

KIRK DESIGNS

Kirk Designs Inc. will design and detail all aspects of the library pertaining to selections for, but not limited to, lighting, flooring, wall and window treatments as well as all furnishings while creating a usable and exciting space for grades Pre-K through Eight. Kirk Designs will interface with vendors as well as provide and enforce a schedule for completion. Kirk Designs will be donating a substantial design cost for each project, approximately \$15,000 per library.

KNOTT MECHANICAL

Knott Mechanical will provide for modifications to the libraries' existing air distribution systems including installation of new diffusers and low-pressure ductwork to conform with the new designs. Knott Mechanical is one of the Baltimore metropolitan area's premier commercial HVAC and plumbing service providers, serving more than 150 clients including Johns Hopkins and Comcast.

MARYLAND FOOD BANK

Maryland Food Bank is happy to investigate the implementation of their school pantry program in each of these school locations and can also help with summer feeding programs when school is out of session.

PARKS AND PEOPLE FOUNDATION

Parks & People will consider each renovated library as a potential site for after school and summer programming. Site assessments for the first six libraries could amount to as much as \$2,000 per site, or a total of \$12,000. For libraries that are determined to be a fit for an after school or summer program, services provided would range from \$5,000-\$80,000 per site. The organization is also involved in green initiatives at each school including asphalt removal and the creation of reading gardens.

RAISING A READER

Raising A Reader is partnering with the Weinberg Foundation to provide library project schools with an opportunity to implement the program in kindergarten classrooms. The partnership covers the cost of training, materials and the financial support needed to implement Raising A Reader for many of our youngest learners and their families.

STATE OF MARYLAND/MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The State of Maryland, through The Maryland State Department of Education will provide focused technical assistance by working with the Manager for Library Media Services for the Baltimore City Public Schools to support the library/media specialists in the Weinberg Library Project schools with the incorporation of digital resources, the utilization of the MDK12 Digital Library, assistance with professional development needs, and with collection development. MSDE staff will also facilitate linkages with public libraries to promote professional development opportunities and broaden access to materials. During the transition to the new Maryland State Common Core Curriculum, MSDE staff will commit time and energy to supporting the work of the library/media center specialists in providing assistance to teachers who are engaged in integrating primary resources into their lessons.

UNITED WAY OF CENTRAL MARYLAND

As part of United Way Worldwide's effort to cut the high school dropout rate in half,

United Way of Central Maryland has joined their call to help recruit one million readers, tutors and mentors and will launch a new volunteer program: Read, Learn, Succeed this fall. We look forward to recruiting members of the community to read to young children to fill in some of the volunteer gaps that exist in many local programs.

VPC, INC.

Handles all of the production and multimedia content creation for Library Project events.

WELLS FARGO

Wells Fargo is proud to further its commitment to Baltimore City students by serving as the Baltimore Elementary and Middle School Library Project's Financial Literacy Partner. Their commitment will include a \$20,000 donation to fund library technology thereby providing access to a world of information including www.handsonbanking.com, the online portal to its free financial literacy program. The company also commits its most valued resource, the time and talent of local Wells Fargo team members. Local team members will provide financial literacy to members of the Weinberg Library communities, including teachers, students and their families. Additionally, through Wells Fargo's Reading First program, team members will read aloud to Pre-K through 1st grade classes to support early childhood literacy and will then donate those books to the library.

Mr. CARDIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

COMMEMORATING VIRGINIA TECH SHOOTING

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to perform a solemn duty today, which is to commemorate the shooting at Virginia Tech of 32 students and faculty members who were killed 6 years ago today and many others who were injured:

Ross Alameddine, Jamie Bishop, Brian Bluhm, Ryan Clark, Austin Michelle Cloyd, Jocelyne Couture-Nowak, Daniel Alejandro Perez Cueva, Kevin Granata, Matthew Gwaltney, Caitlin Hammaren, Jeremy Herbstritt, Rachael Elizabeth Hill, Emily Hilscher, Jarrett Lane, Matthew La Porte, Henry Lee, Liviu Librescu, G.V. Loganathan, Partahi Mamora Halomoan Lumbantoruan, Lauren McCain, Daniel O'Neil, Juan Ramon Ortiz-Ortiz, Minal Panchal, Erin Peterson, Michael Pohle, Julia Pryde, Mary Karen Read, Reema Samaha, Waleed Mohammed Shaalan, Leslie Sherman, Maxine Turner, and Nichole White.

I read those names to honor those who were killed and had their lives snuffed out on April 16, 2007. I acknowledge also that many students and faculty members were injured. We have with us today both family members of those who are deceased and even some students who were injured. I also honor all in the Hokie, the Virginia Tech community that is very close, that still suffers the wounds from this horrible shooting.

In the aftermath of the shooting at Virginia Tech 6 years ago today, we learned a lot. We learned that we have

to make fixes to the mental health system: that school security and safety is incredibly important, that alert systems that can notify people when bad things happen are incredibly important. We also learned a tragic but important lesson; that is, background record checks make us safer. The young, troubled individual with no criminal record who committed those horrible crimes had a long history of mental illness. He had been adjudicated mentally ill and dangerous. Because of that adjudication, he was not supposed to be able to own or purchase weapons, but a flaw in the background record check system kept that record from being entered into the national database. So when he decided and went to purchase the weapons he used in committing this horrible homicide, he was allowed to purchase them.

In the immediate aftermath of the shooting, with the strong support of the Virginia Tech families, we fixed that problem in the background record check. As Governor, I worked with my Republican attorney general, the current Governor of Virginia, Bob McDonnell. We fixed the background record check system that facilitated this gruesome crime. Background records checks make us safer. The better the system, the safer we are.

I later went to my legislature and tried to get them to fix the background record check in another way—by closing the gun show loophole, to require records checks at gun shows. I failed in that task. I not only could not convince my legislature to do it, I could not even convince a single committee to report a bill out to the floor.

That is why I am so glad we are debating on the floor meaningful fixes to gun violence, including a fix to our background record check system when it comes to gun shows or online purchases. I look forward to the debate, and I look forward to supporting the proposals that have been advanced by Senators MANCHIN and TOOMEY.

I read the names, the 32 names of those who were killed. As I conclude, I wish to take a couple of minutes to tell the story of one of the individuals.

I read the name of Liviu Librescu, who was a professor at Virginia Tech, a professor of engineering. He was teaching a course in Norris Hall on the day of this horrible tragedy, and as shots rang out, he heard the shots. He went to the door, and he barricaded the door with his own body, and on the second floor of Norris Hall, he told his students to get out of the window and get to the ground and get to safety. He stood there against the door as Seung-Hui Cho, the shooter, fired repeated rounds through the door, striking his body many times and eventually killing him. But not until the last shot when he was killed did he stop saying to the students: Hurry. You have time. You can get out of the window. And all but one of Liviu Librescu's students were able to get out of the window. One student, Minal Panchal, ended up being

killed because he bravely waited for the other students to go out the window first.

What heroism and bravery. Yet the Liviu Librescu story is even more powerful than that because Liviu Librescu, the professor, was 76 years old—long past retirement age. He had continued to teach because he loved teaching.

He was born in 1930 in Romania. When the Romanian Government became allied with Nazi Germany in 1940, because he was Jewish and his family was Jewish, he was subjected to the persecution Jews in Romania were subjected to, his family was sent into forced labor camps, and Liviu Librescu lived in a crowded ghetto in a Romanian city, being persecuted, but he came through the Holocaust as a survivor. Many Jews, after the war, left Romania because of the persecution of Jews, but it was Liviu Librescu's home, and he stayed. He went to a university, and he became a world-renowned aerospace engineer, and he continued to teach.

But now Romania fell under the influence, as a puppet state, of the Soviet Union. He would not pledge allegiance to the Communist Party. He would not relinquish his tie to his Judaic faith. Because of that, he began to be subjected to persecution for a second time, to be persecuted because of his religion, to be denied the ability to publish articles or travel to academic conferences. Eventually, he lost his job at the university because of his Judaism and because he was unwilling to take the oath of allegiance to the Communist Party.

He was persona non grata in his home country of Romania. However, people in the outside world who knew of his scholarship never let go, and they continued to speak on Liviu Librescu's behalf. He was eventually allowed, in 1977, to emigrate to Israel.

He lived in Israel for 8 years and received a 1-year teaching fellowship at Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, VA. He came for 1 year and never left. He taught as a popular teacher and researcher in Blacksburg, VA, from 1985 until the day he was killed in 2007.

This horrible day, April 16, 2007, started as a normal Monday for virtually everyone who ended up sharing the tragic fate. It was not a normal day. It did not start as a normal day for Liviu Librescu. Liviu Librescu, as a proud Jew, observed that day, from sundown on the 15th of April, the evening before, until sundown on the 16th of April, as Yom HaShoah, Holocaust and Heroism Memorial Day.

Yom HaShoah, in the Jewish religion since 1953, has been a day worldwide where Jews and their allies remember the Holocaust, perpetrators, victims, and the bystanders—the bystanders who wouldn't do anything to stop the atrocity.

They also remember the heroism of those who fought against the Holocaust.

As Professor Librescu went to his class on this day, while it was a normal

Monday for most, I know he walked into his class thinking about Yom HaShoah, perpetrators, victims, bystanders, and heroes. He made a decision, in the split second he heard shots being fired, to be a hero and to save others' lives.

He survived the Holocaust, perpetrated by Nazi Germany, and anti-Semitism in Romania. He survived the persecution perpetrated in his country by the Soviet Union. However, Liviu Librescu could not survive the epidemic of gun violence in this country, the country which he adopted and loved.

In conclusion, I would encourage all of us to take a minute, Senators, staff, pages, people in the gallery, members of the press, take a moment and ask yourselves would you do what Liviu Librescu did. Would you put your body against a door, allow yourself to be shot, and encourage others to be safe? Would you do that? Would we do this?

As I thought about this question, being honest, I would say I hope I would do that. I pray if it comes to that I would act to protect others ahead of myself.

If I am honest with myself, what I have to say is I don't know whether I would do that. I don't know whether I would be a hero like Liviu Librescu. I don't know if I would have the courage to do what Liviu Librescu did.

The good news for those of us who have the honor and blessing to serve in this Chamber is we do not need to put our body in front of bullets to keep people safe. We do not need to put our bodies in front of bullets to protect kids and protect students. All we need to do is have an infinitesimal portion of the courage Liviu Librescu had and cast votes. We need to cast votes on the floor of this body to keep our community safer and to keep our children safer.

I have heard it said this will be a hard vote. For 20 years there has not been a meaningful discussion of these issues on the floor of the Senate because interests are too powerful, the NRA is too powerful. It will be a vote which will be scored, and we need to worry about it. It will take courage. It does not take courage, to any degree, when we think about Liviu Librescu, who saved his students.

Last week I met the daughter of Mary Sherlach, who was the guidance counselor in Sandy Hook who ran to save her students and was killed. When we think about the courage and heroism shown by these individuals, what we are being asked to do on the floor of this body is the least we can do.

It is about heroism. We honor heroes such as Liviu Librescu. The people who put us in office expect us to have at least a small measure of courage, a small measure of heroism. We owe it to those students and others who were shot, killed, and wounded at Virginia Tech. We owe it to the people who were killed or wounded in Newtown. I would ask all my colleagues to reflect upon

the example of Professor Librescu and the heroism he showed as we debate what might be a controversial proposal this week.

Again, the blessing we have as Senators is that we do not have to interpose our bodies in the way of violence to make a difference and make people safer. It is my wish we do that as we debate and vote in the coming days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let me first say I also am on the floor because today is April 16, the sixth anniversary of the horrible shootings at the campus of Virginia Tech. I think every Virginian and every American—I can say Virginians at least—remember when we first received those news reports of the violence perpetrated by Seung-Hui Cho.

I say to my colleague and friend, the Senator from Virginia, in the 33 years we have known each other I have valued his friendship and appreciate his intellect, grace, and knowledge. There was never a moment I was prouder of then-Governor TIM Kaine than those moments after the tragedy.

I don't know if in his comments he noted he had been on a trade mission in Asia when these incidents happened. He barely had landed when he turned around—he and his wife Anne—boarded a plane and came back with virtually no rest. As a Governor you bear these responsibilities in remarkable ways when Virginians are hurt, and in those days he spoke for all of us.

The words he said at the Virginia Tech campus in the ceremony afterward brought together the community and brought together our Commonwealth. In many ways he spoke for our whole Nation, as he has so eloquently spoken this morning. I thank him for what he did as a Virginian in those days afterward and thank him for the eloquent comments he made this morning.

In the aftermath of the tragedy at Virginia Tech, under the leadership of Governor Kaine, Virginia acted. We were within the legislature able to close the legal loophole which allowed Cho, who had been adjudicated mentally unsound, we closed the loophole so he could no longer—or someone who had been adjudicated in such a way—be able to purchase firearms. In the aftermath of the tragedy, then-Governor Kaine appointed a nationally respected commission of experts to recognize what happened and recognize ways we might make all our colleges and universities safer.

This leads me to some of my comments this morning. We are about to take on a debate around how we keep America and Americans safer in a way that also respects our constitutional amendment of the right to keep and bear arms.

An underlying amendment of the bill we are about to debate has at least one part of the legislation which is relatively noncontroversial, a piece of

legislation I have been working on for some time. I know Senator Kaine has supported this as well. The issue is to look at campus safety. It has been one of the top priorities of those victims of the Virginia Tech massacre.

Those families who have spoken with me repeatedly, and with Senator Kaine as well, said let's at least make sure, if a tragic event takes place on a college campus somewhere in America, there are ways we can learn from these tragedies.

So the CAMPUS Safety Act, which is embedded in this legislation, will bring together research and resources on campus safety to strengthen training and improve collaboration. Today, campus public safety officers are the only first responders who don't have access to Federal support to assist in sharing the best practices, relevant research, and training opportunities.

The CAMPUS Safety Act, which received bipartisan support in the committee markup, seeks to address this by consolidating scattered Federal efforts into a national center for campus public safety housed within the Department of Justice. This Center would not only provide a one-stop repository of relevant research but also examples of best practices. It would have an ability to issue grants to colleges, universities, and nonprofit organizations to strengthen efforts to help make our campus community safer.

This kind of planning and training will help prevent future violence on our campuses and will help improve responses in the event of another horrific outbreak of violence on our campus or other university. I am pleased our bipartisan CAMPUS Safety Act is included in the discussions we are having in this body in the coming days and weeks.

I wish to take a moment to speak about a specific aspect of this debate which will, I imagine, be coming up for a vote in the next few days. I stand before my colleagues to say a few words in support of the Manchin-Toomey amendment we will most likely vote on this week. Both Senators Manchin and Toomey have shown courage in working together on what Senator Kaine said is a difficult issue. I support the bipartisan compromise on background checks they proposed.

Their amendment will strengthen our background check system, close the gun show loophole, and prohibit the commercial sale of guns to those who are seriously mentally ill or have a criminal record. Let me also say their amendment also contains appropriate exemptions so responsible gun owners will still be allowed to make direct transactions between family and friends to ensure a father or grandfather could pass that shotgun along to their son or daughter.

Our shared goal is to ensure we keep guns out of the hands of the wrong people while respecting the basic constitutional right to bear arms. I have been disappointed by some who said some-

how this amendment will infringe upon this right. I couldn't disagree more. This has been a common refrain on both sides of the aisle since we started this conversation in December after the tragic events in Newtown.

If we are serious about achieving this goal, the Manchin-Toomey amendment achieves a thoughtful, effective, and balanced approach to achieving our background check system. It strengthens the instant check system of all States to put their information into the NICS, the National Instant Background Check System. One of the outgrowths we saw after the horrible tragedy at Virginia Tech was so many States, while they may have collected this information, didn't even put it into the national database.

One other amendment Senator Toomey put forward would establish a national commission on mass violence to study all the causes of mass violence in our country, including school safety, mental health, issues about firearms, and also issues around some of the images all of us and our children are exposed to in television and film.

This amendment, combined with provisions to prevent gun trafficking and our proposal to improve campus safety, represents a reasonable path forward. In our efforts to reduce violence—as Senator Kaine has so eloquently stated—we are trying to ensure we don't have to create the kinds of heroes which took place 6 years ago on the campus of Virginia Tech.

Let me also add, as I am sure all my colleagues will express, our hearts go out to the families of the victims of the most recent tragedy which took place in Boston. I think I can relate, as a former resident of Boston—and I know Senator Kaine, former Governor Kaine, then-law student TIM Kaine—he and I first met at a law school in Boston—remembering Patriots' Day in Boston, when even if you were not going to run in the marathon, the kind of joy that swept through Boston on Patriots' Day. We all know Boston will be back. We all saw those images yesterday of the horrific tragedy.

I talked to a friend whose wife had literally finished the race 4 minutes before the bombing took place. If she had finished 4 minutes later, he or his daughter or his wife might have been one of the victims of that tragedy. I know, as a father, I called my daughters last night to try to enforce how much I love them, how valuable life is, and how at any moment, whether in a classroom in Virginia Tech or running the Boston Marathon, life can be snuffed out.

I agree with Senator Kaine that in the coming days and weeks, as we have this debate, we are not going to be asked to make acts of courage; we are simply going to be asked to do our job. I believe the Manchin-Toomey amendment and the CAMPUS Safety Act are part of our role and responsibility in doing our job, and I hope we will be able to act on that matter.

With that, I yield the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from Texas.

BOSTON MARATHON BOMBINGS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, yesterday afternoon we were reminded that America faces determined enemies willing to engage in barbaric acts against innocent civilians—men, women, and children. On Patriots' Day—a day that has always been a celebration of American heritage and American freedom—terrorist bombings took the lives of at least three people standing near the finish line of the Boston Marathon, including an 8-year-old boy. His name was Martin Richard. He was watching runners complete the race alongside his family. His mother and his sister also sustained injuries, along with more than 150 other people.

We still don't know who is responsible for this terrible atrocity, but we do know the people of Boston responded to this attack with courage and compassion. As the smoke rose, the American people saw their fellow citizens running toward—not away but toward—the scene of the blast. From the police officers and the first responders who secured the bomb site and loaded the injured into ambulances to the marathon participants who literally ran to hospitals to donate blood, to the doctors and other medical professionals who performed emergency lifesaving treatments on the victims, to the Boston area residents who opened their homes to those who had been left stranded, this attack brought out the very best in our country.

In fact, in the immediate aftermath of the bombing, so many people rushed to donate blood, the Red Cross literally had to turn them away. Dr. Richard Wolfe, the head of the emergency medicine department at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, called it “the smoothest sort of handling of mass casualty I've ever seen in my career”—something I hope none of us have to see again.

This Chamber has spent the last 4 months, and even years before that, debating issues such as taxes, spending, and health care. But the No. 1 responsibility of the Federal Government is to keep the American people safe and secure. Our response to this attack must be firm and unequivocal. We must send a clear message that we will never compromise our values or our freedom in the face of terrorist violence. We must stay on the offensive against the enemies of civilization and remain vigilant in our day-to-day lives. The victims of Boston deserve nothing less.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, morning business is closed.

SAFE COMMUNITIES, SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 649, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 649) to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Manchin amendment No. 715, to protect Second Amendment rights, ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and provide a responsible and consistent background check process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be for debate only.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am glad we are proceeding on this very important legislation. The American people might be wondering why the Senate has not been voting on any amendments to the pending gun legislation.

The Senate voted on Thursday to proceed to the bill. This followed calls that the Senate should debate the bill, and that is why I said I am glad we are getting to it. There has been very little debate. The President has said various proposals deserve a vote. We, on this side of the aisle, don't intend to stand in the way of proceeding on those votes, particularly on the amendments. So I hope we are able to vote very soon.

Last week Senator MANCHIN and Senator TOOMEY unveiled an amendment on background checks. The media hailed the agreement as a way to pass gun control. The majority announced that the Manchin-Toomey amendment would be the first one we vote on. Since we are just starting the debate now, obviously we have not voted on the amendment.

We have not voted because despite claims from the other side, background checks are not and never have been the sweet spot of the gun control debate. We have not voted on it because supporters don't have the votes to pass it—at least at this point that is the way it appears to me—and I think they know it.

They don't have the votes even though published reports indicate that Vice President BIDEN, the President of the Senate, has been calling Senators and asking them to support the

Manchin-Toomey bill. They must not be telling him what he wants to hear. They don't have the votes for background checks even though the Vice President has reportedly stated that the opposition to the proposal comes only from the “black helicopter” crowd.

Well, it doesn't come from that point.

The Manchin-Toomey amendment would impose new obligations on law-abiding gun owners. It would do so even though expanding gun background checks would have done nothing to stop Newtown or other mass killings. It would do so even though expanding background checks would do nothing to prevent these killings in the future.

I often quote the Deputy Director of the National Institute of Justice, who recently wrote that background checks could work only if they were universal and were accompanied by gun registration. Of course, most Members of the Senate oppose gun registration. They know what has happened historically with gun registration. In other countries it has led to gun confiscation, and Members of the Senate—but more importantly, lots of people appearing at our town meetings—fear that could happen and don't want to go down that road.

Supporters of the background check amendment claim that it strengthens the rights of gun owners; but, in fact, it does not. The fact is the opposite is true. Opposition to the amendment does not come from the fringe elements of society. In fact, one of the reasons the Senate has not voted on the amendment is the widespread opposition to the amendment from many quarters. If only fringe elements had problems with it, we would be voting on this amendment. So keep watching. If we do not vote on the Manchin-Toomey amendment, it means the proponents of that idea know they don't have the votes to pass it. If we turn to assault weapons or magazines, then it is clear to all that the majority knows it is far from the number of votes they need. I think people are going to be waiting while they try to pick up the votes that will probably never be there.

Meanwhile, on this side of the aisle, our caucus hopes to have their amendments considered soon and to vote on those amendments. Our amendments, unlike the Manchin-Toomey amendment, will actually strengthen the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding gun owners and help thwart gun violence by criminals. In fact, there are reports that the other side of the aisle wants to block one of our amendments which would do exactly that.

So that is the situation. Maybe there are leaders around here who would dispute me, but that is the way I see it. The majority doesn't have the votes to pass their amendment, so we are not voting. The majority wants to block Republican amendments that they fear would pass, so we are not voting on the Republican amendments either.

The Senate voted to proceed to the bill. The Senate voted to have a debate. The Senate was promised an open amendment process which would mean we would conduct votes on the various amendments that will be offered, but so far that has not happened. I hope it will happen soon, so I ask that the audience stay tuned.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we are debating one of the most important bills we have had before the Senate in a long time. The reason we are debating this subject is because of what happened in Newtown, CT, on December 14, and the gun violence that takes its toll every day in cities all across America, including in my home State of Illinois. We know because we read and hear about it in the news and from the victims.

At this moment our Nation is saddened by what happened yesterday in Boston. We still don't know what the cause of that was or who was responsible for it. I just have to say we are stunned by it.

Members of the Senate and I—who have worked on the immigration bill—had planned to announce that bill today in a press conference. We have postponed that announcement out of respect to the people who have fallen, those who were injured, and their families. It is a moment of grave concern across America which was expressed well by the President last night.

We are waiting for the information and details to build a case on those who are responsible. I, for one—and I am sure my colleagues feel the same way—don't want to rush to judgment until we have the facts as to the parties responsible. The sadness we feel for the victims and the sadness we feel for America—an open and free America where people stand on the sidelines cheering marathon runners—is one that is profound in the Senate today.

The issue before us now is gun safety. It comes before us because 20 beautiful little first graders were massacred at their grade school—at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, CT. Six of their teachers and administrators literally gave their lives in defense of those children. There is not a parent or grandparent alive who doesn't identify with that horrible loss.

Last week I met with a group of parents, still grieving, from Sandy Hook Elementary School who came to Congress to beg us to do something to spare future families and future children from this type of massacre. I met with them in the morning. As you can imagine, there was not a dry eye in the room as they showed me the photographs of their beautiful children who are now gone. I commend them for their courage and stepping forward.

Now the question is whether the Senate has the courage to step forward. This is not an easy vote politically. I think we know what is at stake. I come

from a pretty diverse State. I come from downstate Illinois, which is more rural. They have small towns and more gun owners than the great city of Chicago.

For 14 years, as a Congressman in downstate Illinois, I ran in an area where gun issues were very volatile and very important to many people. I took some positions which the gun lobby did not care for, and several times they decided they would wage a campaign against me when I ran for reelection. I survived their attacks and eventually was elected to the Senate.

This is the first meaningful gun safety legislation we have taken up since I was elected to this body over 16 years ago. We are here because of what happened in Newtown, CT. There is no question about it.

I often remind people that it was a little over 2 years ago that one of our own, Gabrielle Giffords, a Congresswoman from Arizona, was at a town meeting when she was gunned down and shot pointblank in the face. We did nothing about it. There were no hearings or changes in the law. It was just another gun statistic to many people.

But Newtown touched our hearts: to think that those beautiful little children could be massacred in their grade school classroom. One child was shot 11 times with a semiautomatic weapon that was firing off rounds as fast as this deranged individual could load it.

We are here today in the beginning of a debate on this important legislation. What is at stake? Well, this is about background checks. Here are the basic questions we need to ask: Do we believe the current Federal law, which prohibits a convicted felon, a person who is under an order from the court to avoid domestic abuse, a person who has been judged mentally incompetent—should they be able to buy a gun in America?

Now, 90 percent of Americans say that is an easy question, and the answer is, no; they should not be able to buy a gun. In fact, 75 percent of gun owners say that.

I come from a family of gun owners. They are responsible, law-abiding citizens who would never dream of looking the other way if a convicted felon or mentally deranged person wanted to buy a gun. They store their guns safely. They use them in a safe manner, and they represent the majority of gun owners across America.

So if this is such an obvious question where 90 percent of Americans agree we should not sell guns to those who have been convicted of a felony, for example, why is this being debated? What is the big deal? It comes down to the second part of the question: What would you think—and this Capitol is filled with tourists, many of whom flew on airplanes to get here today—if before the plane took off, the flight attendant said: Welcome aboard; fasten your seatbelts. We hope everyone has a safe flight. Incidentally, the TSA would like to inform everyone that they have

closely checked the passengers onboard the plane to see if they are carrying guns or bombs. We are happy to report we have checked 60 percent of them, and they are not carrying guns or bombs. Have a nice flight.

Sixty percent—does that give anybody refuge, consolation, or peace of mind? That is what is going on today with the sale of guns. Up to forty percent of firearms sold in America today are not subject to background checks.

What difference does that make? I want to tell the story which goes back to a moment in history in my State of Illinois which illustrates why this is so important. Ricky Byrdsong was the head coach of the Northwestern University men's basketball team back in the 1990s. He was a great fellow. He was a loving father of three children and a man of deep Christian faith.

On July 2, 1999, Coach Byrdsong was walking with two of his children through his neighborhood in Skokie, IL, a great town. A White supremacist drove up and shot Ricky Byrdsong to death in front of his kids. He was 43 years old.

This gunman ended up going on a shooting spree for days across Illinois and Indiana, randomly targeting African Americans, Jews, and Asian Americans. In the end, he killed two and wounded nine.

Here is the reality. The man who did the shooting never, ever should have owned a gun. He was prohibited by law from buying guns because of a domestic violence restraining order against him. Before his murderous rampage, he tried to buy a gun from a federally licensed dealer in Peoria Heights, IL. He was rejected when it was revealed he was prohibited from purchasing a gun. But this white supremacist took advantage of a gap in our background check laws that still exists today. He found an advertisement for guns in the classified ad section of a newspaper.

A gun trafficker named Donald Fiessinger had been buying guns from a dealer—over 72 guns in a 2-year period—then turning around and reselling them through classified ads to buyers who wouldn't have to go through a background check. Ricky Byrdsong's killer bought two handguns from Fiessinger without a background check. He then used those guns on a shooting spree and killed Ricky Byrdsong on the streets of Skokie in front of his children.

The amendment before us today would make that more difficult, if not impossible. Under the Manchin-Toomey amendment, a background check would be required to sell guns advertised in a newspaper. This would have shut down the opportunity for Ricky Byrdsong's killer to get this murderous weapon. That is one of the issues before us, and it is critically important.

JOE MANCHIN is from West Virginia. JOE MANCHIN is a conservative Democrat, no question about it; no debate on that issue. PAT TOOMEY is one of the

most conservative Republicans from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The two of them came together and said, Let's write something that is respectful of the Second Amendment, respectful of the rights of gun owners, but closes the gaps in the law when it comes to background checks. I think they have done a good job. But let me add quickly they put some things in this amendment I don't like at all. Let me be specific.

The amendment repeals the law that prevents gun dealers from selling handguns to out-of-State buyers, and it expands civil immunity to unlicensed gun dealers. I don't want to vote for those two things, but this is the nature of a compromise and this is the nature of the Senate. If we are going to pass this, I have to be prepared to take on and accept some issues I personally don't agree with because of the larger good. To me, the notion of plugging this 40-percent gap in the sale of firearms is so compelling I am prepared to accept parts of this amendment I don't like. I am never going to get exactly what I want on the floor of the Senate, nor will any Senator, nor should they expect to. We have differences of opinion, differences of party, differences of philosophy.

I commend Senators MANCHIN and TOOMEY for stepping up. This wasn't easy. They could have stepped back and said, Let somebody else do this. They haven't. I know they have taken some grief over it. The major gun lobby organizations oppose this Manchin-Toomey amendment, but we need to do this. Would it have saved the lives of those children at Newtown, CT? No. This measure would not have, because the guns he used were purchased by his mother who could legally purchase the guns. But it could have saved the life of Ricky Byrdsong and it could also save the lives of so many others who are being gunned down on the streets because people are owning and using guns who have no legal right to them. The Manchin-Toomey amendment moves us in the direction of closing that gap in the law.

I know the gun lobby opposes this amendment. I don't know what their position is on the underlying bill, but I know that Americans and gun owners overwhelmingly support it. So here is the question: Can the Senate rise above the political pressure and vote for this measure? We need 60 votes, and it means it has to be bipartisan, not just the majority on this side of the aisle, but a good number on the other side.

I am encouraged by last week's vote because last week we had a preliminary vote, a procedural vote, about whether we were even going to debate this issue, and there was a question about it. Before the vote came up, 13 Republican Senators, supported by the Republican minority leader, sent a public letter saying they were going to oppose any effort to even debate the gun issue on the floor of the Senate. It looked pretty bad when the Republican leader

took that position. But 16 Republican Senators stepped up and showed, I thought, courage and a commitment to this institution by voting with us to move forward on this debate. I am not assuming their votes on any issues, but I want to commend them in the spirit of this institution which has failed in recent years to accept its mandate and deliberate and vote on the most important issues of our time. I commend them for remembering that and for committing themselves to at least engaging in this debate on the floor of the Senate.

What about background checks and the Second Amendment? Well, the gun lobby argues that background checks are unconstitutional, even though Justice Scalia made it clear in the *Heller* decision, which was the decision on the Second Amendment that said, basically, the Second Amendment is a personal right to bear arms, not the right of a militia, which had been argued for years. Scalia said in that decision: "laws imposing conditions and qualifications on the commercial sale of arms" are "presumptively lawful." So there is no doubt, at least in Justice Scalia's mind or mine, that a background check is consistent with the Second Amendment.

The gun lobby also argues that background checks are ineffective. We have heard this argument: Well, go ahead and pass all the laws you want and all the law-abiding citizens will live by them but the criminals won't. Here is what they failed to note. Nearly 2 million prohibited purchasers have been blocked from buying a gun since background checks went into effect. They were so stupid, so careless, they tried to buy a gun anyway. They were stopped. The argument, of course, then goes: Well, why are there so many gun crimes committed? Well, because they get guns through other means which are also addressed by the bill. Straw purchases, for example; or through the ads in the newspaper I mentioned earlier. And the argument that unless a law is air tight and will stop all gun violence we shouldn't pass it—are we going to use that standard for speeding on highways or for texting on highways? I don't think so. We do our best to set a reasonable standard for the good of this society, understanding there will be those who violate the law. The same thing holds true for this argument.

The gun lobby argues we should not improve background checks until we prosecute more cases where buyers fail their background checks. Well, what of the agency that gathers information for that prosecution—ATF the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives? If we look to that agency, we will note that for years now the gun lobby and the NRA have worked to keep this as a leaderless agency and to make sure it didn't have the power to enforce the laws on the books. They can't have it both ways. They can't stop the ATF from its job and then

argue they don't prosecute these gun violations seriously.

Here is the bottom line: We are going to have votes soon to see where Members of the Senate stand. Are they going to stand with our police officers, religious leaders, teachers, prosecutors, doctors, mayors, and the victims of gun violence and their families? Are they going to stand with the strong majority of 90 percent of Americans who support these reform proposals to save lives in this country? Or, will they stand with the gun lobby that refuses to compromise even when lives could be saved?

I know where I am going to stand. I am going to stand with Ricky Byrdsong's family and his widow Sherialyn. She wrote me earlier this year when I held a hearing on gun violence and this is what she said:

How a criminal is able to buy a gun with no questions asked is absurd. Something must be done about this.

An important question from an important person whose life was changed forever because we do not have a strong law. I stand with so many other families who have suffered tragedy, including those families from Newtown who were here last week, as well as the families and the victims in my hometown of East St. Louis, IL, and the city of Chicago I am honored to represent. They are sick and tired of the gun lobby that puts industry profits before common sense and they are tired of the gun lobby having its way in Congress year after deadly year.

I urge my colleagues to join with the majority of Americans who support commonsense reforms for gun safety. I urge my colleagues to support the compromise Manchin-Toomey amendment and the bipartisan legislation on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the period for debate only on the firearms bill, S. 649, be extended until 3:30 p.m. and that I be recognized at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. We will continue to work on getting an agreement setting forth some initial amendments and votes in relation to the gun safety legislation. The Republican leaders said they needed to have their caucus first. We are hopeful that we will receive a positive response to our efforts soon after the two caucus lunches and begin moving forward on some initial amendments and votes in relation to gun safety legislation.

RECESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we recess until 2:15 p.m. for our caucuses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:20 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

SAFE COMMUNITIES, SAFE
SCHOOLS ACT OF 2013—Continued

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, my colleagues, the week is finally here when we come to the floor to have votes on a piece of legislation we have been waiting on for decades. This Chamber is finally talking about what we can do to stop the plague of gun violence which has rippled through every single corner of this country.

As I watched these mass shootings play out over the course of the last 10 years—whether it be in Colorado or Arizona or Virginia—we think to ourselves that this is just something we are watching. This is just something that has happened somewhere else to someone else. We never think it could happen to us.

I will never forget that day I was in Bridgeport, CT, and it was right before Christmas. We were getting ready to take a train so I could bring my two little boys, along with my wife, to look at the pageantry of New York City. That was the day I got the call that there had been a shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School.

I thought it must have been a mistake. I thought, well, to the extent there is something going on at Sandy Hook Elementary School—this quiet hamlet in western Connecticut—it must be some disgruntled employee who walked in and had a grudge.

What I learned over the next few minutes during the half-hour drive to Newtown made my blood freeze. I learned this was a mass shooting involving dozens of adults and kids. I realized it was now happening in my neighborhood, in my State, in my town.

Unfortunately—as I stood at the firehouse where the community gathered that day and all the parents stood waiting for their children to come back or not come back from that school—I realized I had way too many colleagues

I could call upon for advice on how, as an elected official, to deal with a tragedy of this magnitude. I could call my friends in Arizona, I could call my friends in Colorado, or I could call my new colleague, Governor Kaine, from Virginia. There were too many places to turn, and it happened to us in Connecticut in a place we never, ever thought would be subjected to gun violence. We are finally at the tipping point on a debate of what we can do. Through all of the back and forth this week and last week about whether we would have a vote on this floor or would we have to overcome a filibuster, could we come to a compromise on background checks, would we add provisions to ban high-capacity magazines, underneath it all are these victims. There have been thousands of victims. There were the little girls and boys in Newtown, but also 16-, 17-, 31-, and 68-year-olds from across the country who have been gunned down over the course of the last several decades without this body raising a finger to try to make things different. Well, it is time for those victims' stories to be told.

As I did last week, I will be on the floor this week so I can share the stories of victims of gun violence. I will tell stories of lives which were cut way too short because of guns, and, in part, because this body has not been serious enough to stand up and do something about it.

I want to start this afternoon's remarks by returning to the place where it all started for me, and that is Sandy Hook Elementary School. There are 26 stories to tell of the people who lost their lives at that school that day, and I think I have gotten to about 20 or 21 of them. I will talk about the last few stories. It is unbelievable.

I have not had a chance to tell the story of Anne Marie Murphy, even though I told the story of what she did that day on the floor at least once. I just shared her story with my Democratic colleagues.

Before that fatal day, Anne Marie Murphy was an amazing person. Anne Marie was a special education teacher, and she loved her work. She sought out working in the area of special education because she knew she had a talent, as so many of her students and the parents who worked with her found out. They knew she had a talent for reaching out and touching little boys' and little girls' lives.

In fact, it is not a coincidence that a number of the kids who were killed in Sandy Hook Elementary School that day were kids with autism because Sandy Hook was known as a school that had a talent for reaching out to kids on the autistic spectrum. And Anne Marie was part of that story. She was a special education teacher. She was a mother of four wonderful children: Kelly, Colleen, Paige, and Thomas. She grew up in Katonah, NY. She graduated from St. Mary's School there before attending JFK High

School in Somers, NY. Then she got her degree in Connecticut at a school that actually was in the process of educating one of the other teachers who was killed that day, Victoria Soto. Southern Connecticut State University is where she got her degree.

She was remembered by her friends and family as sweet, happy, outgoing, and caring, and all of those characteristics came into play that day. I shared this story with my colleagues last week and then behind closed doors today, but I will share it quickly again.

That day, Anne Marie Murphy had in her charge a little boy named Dylan Hockley. When the bullets started flying, Anne Marie took Dylan into her arms and did her best to comfort him and perhaps shield him. When the police came into that classroom, that is how they found Dylan and Anne Marie—in each other's arms. To the Hockleys, the fact that there was some small measure of love being expressed to Dylan in the last horrible moments gives them some small measure of peace. She died a hero doing what she did best.

Anne Marie had been doing this for awhile, but she had a lot of years to give. She was only 52 years old. She could have continued to change the lives of children in need, children with autism, for another 10-plus years. Just think of all the lives she could have affected. How many more Dylan Hockleys could she have found and nurtured and helped work through their autism? We will never get to know. She was killed that day.

Grace McDonnell's parents are amazing. They have been down here to Washington a number of times already. They have led a lot of the debate in our communities in Connecticut about what we do to change the issue of guns and gun violence. They do so because they lost their daughter Grace McDonnell that day.

Grace was 7 years old when she died. Grace had asked for a purple cake with a turquoise peace sign and polka dots when she turned 7. That is what she wanted, I guess, for her birthday, was that purple cake. She loved the color purple and she loved the color pink, as so many of these girls did, and her funeral, which I had the honor of attending, was just buried in pink.

Grace loved the beach. One could always find Grace McDonnell on the beach. She loved country music. Taylor Swift and Kenny Chesney were amongst her favorites. She played soccer. She participated in gymnastics. She had a dog, Puddin', that she absolutely adored.

She was a very kind, wonderful little girl, so her parents have tried to think of the ways, big and small, in which they can try to pass along the kindness their 7-year-old little girl Grace showed for the world. They have done that by trying to explain to this country who she is. They have done that by taking all the art she produced—Grace was a fantastic artist, and many of us

have pieces of original art that Grace McDonnell did hanging on our walls in our offices or at our homes. But the McDonnells do small things. Following her memorial service, they stopped at a local restaurant and they ordered a cupcake for every patron who came into the establishment that day—white cake, chocolate frosting, pink and white sprinkles—just to do a small little thing to spread Grace's love throughout this devastated community.

Coincidentally, it was after Grace's funeral that I received word that the NRA was going to oppose virtually everything we did. Up until that moment, I had hoped the NRA was going to be a partner with us. I remember walking out of Grace McDonnell's funeral—amongst the dozens of wakes and funerals I went to over those 2 weeks—and getting a copy of the NRA statement handed to me. It was that day that I understood we were in for a fight, one a lot of us who were in the midst of that grief didn't expect we were going to have. We thought Newtown was going to bring us all together. Unfortunately, for some, it has not.

Allison Wyatt died that day. Allison was 6 years old. Allison was an overwhelmingly kind girl.

All of these little boys and girls were kind because, frankly, that is what most little boys and girls are when they are 6 and 7 years old. They are wonderfully kind. This tragedy kills us inside because we know that 6- and 7-year-olds remind all of us about what we want to be.

Allison once gave her snack to a hungry stranger on a plane. She gave it away as a simple act of kindness. She had a passion for drawing. She wanted to be an artist when she grew up. She would cover the walls of her house with her drawings, turning every room in the Wyatts' house into her own little art studio. In fact, just before her death, she had drawn a picture for her teacher Victoria Soto, and she had written on that picture, "I love you, Love, Allie." Both Victoria Soto and her student Allison Wyatt died that day. Her daycare teacher said of Allison that "she would come and put her head down on your shoulder if she was upset. It would make her feel better. She was just such a sweet and caring girl."

Twenty-six teachers and students died that day in Sandy Hook, and we will remember every single one of them. Twenty-eight people died that day, and we have to remember that. As much anger and often hatred as we have for the shooter and as much confusion as we have about his mother and the questions we ask about why she would give him access to those kinds of weapons, knowing how troubled he was—28 people did die that day, 26 at the Sandy Hook Elementary School. But here is the thing. Every day more than that die in this country from gun violence. Every day, on average, 30 peo-

ple die from gun violence across this country.

I have had this chart up for the last week, and it is hard to read if the viewer is in the gallery or in this Chamber or watching from somewhere else because each one of these little figures represents someone who has been killed by guns since December 14, 2012. In the now almost 4 months since that day—I think it is over 4 months now—over 3,400 people have died from guns all across this country.

We, as a legislative body, over the past several decades, seem to have become immune to the everyday gun violence that happens. We are just sort of used to picking up our local paper and reading about another shooting, reading about another victim, such as those who have died in my State, in New Haven and Hartford and Bridgeport, on a pretty regular basis.

This debate has to be not just about what we can do to try to lessen the likelihood that anyone has to call me and ask for advice on how they should handle the latest mass shooting in their State or their district, but it also has to be an answer to the thousands of people who are losing their lives on the streets of America due to routine, everyday gun violence. That is what the compromise that is on the floor for debate right now will do.

Since we put into place our background checks law, there have been hundreds of thousands of people who have been legally prohibited from buying guns because they were felons or they had been convicted of domestic abuse or they were judged so mentally ill that they shouldn't own guns. Hundreds of thousands of people have walked into gun stores and have been prevented from buying guns because of our background check law. The problem is that only about 60 percent of gun sales go through those background checks, and 90 percent of Americans agree we should apply background checks to as many people as we can to make sure criminals don't have guns. If criminals didn't have guns, I can virtually guarantee my colleagues that this visual would be a little less stunning than it is today. It wouldn't erase these figurines. Background checks, if they were universal, wouldn't erase the scourge of violence across this country, but it would certainly lessen the impact of this chart.

So let's talk about some of the victims of urban gun violence—of gun violence in our communities that is a 1-day story in the paper, not the multiday episode a mass shooting may be.

We can talk about someone like Kwante Feliciano. Kwante was killed just about a month ago in Hartford, CT. The shooting occurred on March 25. Kwante was shot in the chest, and a companion, 30-year-old Kelly Cooper, was shot in the head. Both of them were pronounced dead at St. Francis Hospital.

Kwante was a product of the Hartford public school system, and he was try-

ing to do better for himself. There are a lot of kids who drop out of the Hartford public school system, but Kwante had figured out a way to graduate and was also trying to get himself employed in a tough economy. He was attending Lincoln Technical Institute, and he was studying to be an automotive technician at the time of his death. His obituary said that he was loved by everybody who came in contact with him and that what defined him to most of his friends and his family was his 100-watt smile.

Hartford is a tough place to grow up. There are a lot of kids who don't see a way out of their situation. But this young man did. He had gotten his high school diploma. He was trying to do something to make himself better by becoming an automotive technician, and he was shot dead in the chest just a few short weeks ago. Kelly, by the way, who was shot with him, leaves behind four children, four brothers, and one sister.

Kanasha Isaac was 16 years old. She was described by her friends as a social butterfly. She was full of energy and life. Her family was her center. Her uncle's home was always the place where her friends and her family congregated when they were there. Kanasha was the center of all of her family's life.

After exiting a local restaurant, Kanasha and her boyfriend got into their car. Another car pulled up beside them, blocked them as they were going into a parking space, and a man shot at their car. He shot Kanasha in the face. She died shortly thereafter at 16 years old. This was in Florida on February 24 of this year.

Kanasha was going to the local high school. She wasn't the first victim of gun violence in recent months. In December two high school classmates of hers, Coby Deleon and Natalia Trejo, were killed in a murder-suicide. Three students in this one local high school in Florida were killed in about a 2-month, 3-month period of time.

Christopher Walker was 19 years old, and he was shot on March 12 of this year in Milton, GA. It was an attempted robbery. He was a marketing student at Georgia Perimeter College, and he had just been accepted into Kennesaw State University for the upcoming fall semester. That is a big deal. He had been trying to do right for himself and his family. He had been studying marketing, and he had just gotten accepted into Kennesaw State University. He was excited about getting into that school. He was already working to pay for his degree. He was a successful salesman at a local Sears store, and he was doing all of this with a goal toward the long term. He was a great salesman. He was studying marketing.

He was going to get his degree, but he really loved music. His dream was to become a musician. Even as this 19-year-old college student was looking for a job, he was recording as much music as he could, and his goal was to

take his music and not keep the money he collected from it for himself; he was going to donate it to charity. So he was going to pursue his college degree, go out and continue to be a salesman, and do music on the side simply to make enough money to give to charity.

What an amazing kid, 19 years old. In an attempted robbery on March 12 of this year, Christopher Walker was shot dead in Milton, GA.

Dominique Boyer was 18 when he was shot in Atlanta, GA, on March 28.

All of these victims, by the way, are part of this chart. Unfortunately, I do not have to go back 6 months or a year or a year and a half to find an endless list of victims. We are just talking about March of this year.

Dominique was 18 years old and just months away from his high school graduation when he became an unintentional, innocent victim of a shooting in DeKalb County, GA. Dominique was a senior at Columbia High School and he had been planning to go to college to become an accountant.

His classmates remember him as happy, as outgoing, as a very respectful kid with a lot of friends. He was the oldest of four siblings. He was just months away; he was going to graduate this fall. He was going to go to college, and he was an unintentional, innocent victim of a shooting.

We hear this over and over and over. I have read now probably 50- or 60-plus stories of kids—18, 19 years old—who have been killed. The highest incidence of gun violence occurs to 19-year-olds, I think, followed by 18-year-olds, followed by 17-year-olds. It is really teenagers who are getting killed out there. Unfortunately, in Connecticut, it was 6- and 7-year-olds, but kids who are not much older than the kids who died in Sandy Hook are dying every day in this country from gun violence, and most of them are unintentional, innocent victims. At some level a lot of people want to believe that the people who are killed in urban gun violence are killed in connection with a crime or are wrapped up in gangs. Some of that is true, but the stories we are hearing are of good kids who were doing the right thing; who, as the President has said, were not in the wrong place at the wrong time but were in the right place at the right time.

Dominique Boyer was a respectful kid who treated everybody well but just happened to be in the way of a bullet that maybe was not designated for him but should not have been flying through the air in the first place.

Hakeem Jackson was 17 years old when he was killed a couple weeks before Dominique on March 11, 2013, in Knoxville, TN. He was just on a weekend visit to Knoxville visiting his family and his grandmother. Hakeem's mom described him as a quiet and bashful boy but sometimes a little bit of a prankster.

On a Friday night he asked his grandmother for some money. He was 17 years old. He just wanted to go down

to the store. While he was walking down a street in a city that was not even his own, a gray sedan pulled up and shot Hakeem several times. Those shots eventually killed him. He was 17 years old, just visiting his grandmother in Knoxville, TN.

Let me share a couple more stories with you.

Kay Cornell Janus was on the other end of life's spectrum. She was 72 when she was shot just 1 day before Hakeem in Marietta, GA. She was known for her grace and her poise, and, again, as you have heard about a number of these victims, her radiant smile—something her family and friends remembered about her.

She was full of class. She loved fine food and wine and traveling and entertaining. Many of these hobbies became, over the course of her life, her passion. She was the mother of four, and she was the grandmother of two.

She was shot in her garage by her longtime boyfriend. Neighbors suspect that the murder may have been the result of a simple dispute they were having over finances. It ended in Kay, 72 years old, being gunned down.

Zachary Rose was killed in January of this year. He was celebrating his 22nd birthday. Two days later, after his 22nd birthday, he was killed. His loves were skateboarding and cars and dogs—dogs at the top of his list. He absolutely loved dogs, and he had a Great Dane, Mathias, that all of his friends said after he was killed was really "his baby."

He actually loved dogs so much that he ran his own dog training company. Zachary's friend dedicated a page of their company's Web site to help raise money for Zachary's funeral because his family was going through very tough times, and when he was killed, leaving behind three siblings—a brother and two sisters—they did not have enough money to pay for his funeral.

His friends said Zachary was the kind of guy who "literally had no enemies"—killed by guns on January 28, 2013.

His family did not have the money to pay for his funeral. It is the story of a lot of these families. Families are already going through tough times. Luckily, a lot of these communities rally to the victims' defense to raise the money for these funerals. But think about that. Think about going through the pain and the grief of losing your child or your son or your daughter or your grandson or your sister or your brother, and then looking into your family's accounts and not even having enough money to bury them. That is the reality of what is happening across this Nation today because it happens too often.

There has been another trend in the last several months that has in some ways been even more disturbing than the overall incidence of 3,000-plus people having died across our country. We have seen a very disturbing trend, in the last several months even, of acci-

dental deaths from guns. As we have said, there is no one solution to this plague of gun violence. It is getting tougher on our gun laws: making sure criminals do not have them who should not, trying to take some of these dangerous weapons—the assault weapons and the dangerous high-capacity ammunition—off the streets, having a better mental health system. But it is also about gun safety. It is also about making sure if someone is going to be a gun owner they be a responsible gun owner, that they put a lock on their gun and keep it away from children.

Over the past several months there have been four absolutely tragic shootings involving toddlers.

A Tennessee woman was shot in the stomach by her 2-year-old child who discovered a Glock 9 stored underneath a pillow. The child picked it out from under the pillow, discharged the weapon, and shot Rekia Kid while she was sleeping.

Josephine Fanning was shot and killed in Tennessee when a 4-year-old boy discharged a handgun owned by Fanning's husband, who had just kept the gun loaded, in his words, "for just a moment." A 4-year-old boy.

A 6-year-old boy was accidentally shot and killed by his 4-year-old playmate in a quiet residential New Jersey neighborhood. "This never should have happened," the victim's uncle said. "It's horrible."

A 3-year-old died recently of an accidental self-inflicted gun wound in South Carolina after finding a gun in an apartment and discharging the weapon.

A 2-year-old shooting his mother, a 4-year-old shooting an adult, a 6-year-old getting shot by a 4-year-old, and a 3-year-old shooting themselves—these accidental shootings are likely not going to be solved by a background check law or by a ban on high-capacity ammunition, but it just speaks to how big this problem is. It speaks to how many guns are out there.

It also speaks to the fact that as part of our debate on background checks and on specific weaponry that should be kept in the hands of the military, we should be having a conversation about gun safety as well.

Lastly, I want to talk about the importance of today.

Senator KAINE, I believe, was down on the floor earlier talking about the 6-year anniversary of the worst mass shooting in this country's history at Virginia Tech. I want to close by just telling a few final stories about those victims. I have told some of them when I have been down here before, but that shooting was in some ways just as tragic.

In Sandy Hook, we had a little glimpse into who these little boys and girls would be. When we heard these stories about their intellectual curiosity and their kindness and their grace, we had a window into what amazing people folks such as Dylan Hockley and Grace McDonnell and

Madeleine Hsu would eventually grow up to be.

In Virginia Tech, though, we had a much better window into these kids because though they had not reached maturity, they had already succeeded by getting into Virginia Tech, and we could really see the kind of contributions they were going to leave.

Austin Michelle Cloyd lived life boldly. She had traveled the world with her family. She was interested in everything from politics to environmental issues to international relations. She was a very tall girl and everybody remembered what Austin looked like because she had flaming red hair and a big, bright smile. She played basketball throughout her middle and high school years, and she worked four summers with the Appalachia Service Project to help make homes better for people—to make them warmer and safer and dryer.

She loved reading and scuba diving and music and concerts, and she was just a girl who was absolutely full of life. She lived her life for a purpose. She knew she wanted to help people.

She had a brilliant mind and a compassionate heart and she had an iron will. We will never know what Austin was going to truly grow up to be. She was killed that day at Virginia Tech.

Jocelyne Couture-Nowak was a French Canadian who had a passion for teaching French. She was a faculty member who was killed that day. Before she moved to Virginia, she was very well known for being instrumental in helping to develop a school to ensure access for francophone families who wanted a safe school environment and a French language education.

She went between Nova Scotia and southwest Virginia. She loved the bucolic countryside, and she loved to go on hikes, whether it was in Virginia or back in Nova Scotia.

She was passionate for French education. She was passionate that other people would learn the language, and she still had a lot of passion to give. But she was killed that day as well.

Matthew Gwaltney was a second-year master's student in the Civil and Environmental Engineering Department. His professional goal was to go out and increase awareness and education about environmental issues. He wanted to encourage people to be proactive in their individual lives to try to better our environment, whether it was just leaving a smaller and more confined footprint on this world or going out and creating systems in their community to lower the impact of pollution.

His passion was environmental awareness, but he was also a big fan of sports. He was a detailed expert in sports statistics, and you could not beat Matthew in a game of trivia. He loved his Hokies and was a devoted fan, and he went to every ACC sporting event he could. Professionally, he loved the Atlanta Braves and the Chicago White Sox and the Chicago Bulls.

Matthew was going to lead a great life—one that was lived outwardly. But

we never got to see the maturity of his passion for environmental awareness, nor his passion for the hobbies he loved because Matthew was killed that day at Virginia Tech.

The list just goes on and on and on—3,400 people killed since December 14. I have in the Chamber just a few of the pictures of the young men and women who have been killed in Hartford and Bridgeport and New York and Washington and Newtown, CT. It is their memories we will honor this week as we go forward on one of the most important public safety debates this Chamber and this city has ever had.

I will be back down to the Senate floor later this week to continue to engage my colleagues in talking about the real reason we are here; that is, the victims of gun violence all across this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for debate only on S. 649 be extended until 5:30 p.m., and that the majority leader be recognized at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I wish to begin by saying my thoughts and prayers, similar to those of so many Americans, are with Boston today, with the families and loved ones of those who have lost lives or been injured. I offer my deepest condolences to the families of those victims and my sincere gratitude to the courageous first responders, including many of the runners who courageously went to the aid of people who were grievously injured and some maimed by this horrific act of terror. Whether we call it a terrorist act or an act of terror or simply a criminal murder, it is certainly to be condemned and investigated as thoroughly and promptly as possible. I know the full resources of the Federal Government have been devoted to this purpose.

We are an open society. We appear soft-hearted to people who want to do harm to a democracy. We are vulnerable because we are a democracy and we are open. We have resolved that we will not become totalitarian or anti-democratic; that we will remain a free and open society. That is the wonder and strength and uniqueness of America, the greatest Nation in the history of the world.

Horror has brought us to this debate, the horror of gun violence, the horror of what has happened in our schools, our streets, our neighborhoods, in places where the public is admitted, in-

deed welcomed, whether it is movie theaters or places of worship or schools, places where the public has access and where, therefore, all our citizens, most especially our children, are vulnerable.

Last week when we opened this debate we spent a lot of time talking about victims. Senator MURPHY and I spent a lot of time on the Senate floor discussing Newtown and the victims of that unspeakable and unimaginable tragedy. Today we remember another similar tragedy, facilitated by the same extraordinarily dangerous weapons in the hands of people who should not be permitted to have firearms or guns. Six years ago today, Seung-Hui Cho used two semiautomatic handguns and nine 10- and 15-round magazines to kill 32 innocent victims and injure 23 at Virginia Tech University. Many of those weapons he used were purchased online. Others were purchased at local stores without a background check.

As somebody who has seen my own State grapple with this tragedy, I extend my condolences to the families of Virginia Tech victims—some of their families were here earlier today—and all who have felt the impact of this absolutely senseless slaughter, as senseless and unspeakable as what happened in Newtown just 4 months ago.

I wish to recognize the leadership of our two Senators from Virginia and their efforts to prevent another Virginia Tech. As he discussed earlier, Senator WARNER has been actively engaged in efforts to bring research and resources together to make our schools and campuses safer. His leadership has been extremely important. Colleges and universities play an extraordinarily important role in my own State of Connecticut. I know they are constantly working to keep their campuses safe. The School and Campus Safety Enhancements Act included in the gun violence legislation currently before this body would be an important step toward giving these very institutions of higher learning what they need to protect our students and support the kind of research that is necessary to develop new means and possibly new technology, new tools that our institutions of higher learning but also institutions of learning across-the-board, beginning with our elementary schools, need to do better.

I am proud to be cosponsor of this legislation. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure its passage. Senator KAINE spoke so powerfully and eloquently on the floor earlier today, showed such grace under pressure—which is one of the definitions of courage—in responding to the Virginia Tech tragedy. He has worked to deal with the wounds. He has resolved to learn from Virginia Tech and indeed he worked as a Governor to seek safer campuses across Virginia and across the country. He fought to put in place commonsense laws that would prevent shooters such as Seung-Hui Cho from having access to the arsenal

he used 6 years ago. I thank Senator KAINE for helping to lead the effort for a ban on high-capacity ammunition magazines such as the ones used at Virginia Tech and used at Newtown and used in so many other shootings across the country over the years. With his support, I plan to offer a high-capacity magazine ban, on behalf of Senator LAUTENBERG, in an amendment to the gun violence legislation currently before the Senate.

I am proud to be working with others, such as Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator SCHUMER, and my colleague Senator MURPHY, in that effort. I encourage my colleagues to work with me and Senator KAINE to pass commonsense legislation as we mark the tragedy at Virginia Tech and we remember the victims of Newtown.

I thank the families of the victims of these shootings from all across the country who have come to Washington over these past days, and indeed weeks, working so hard and so diligently, working through their grief and pain, doing something that is so difficult for them so others can be spared this pain and grief.

Many will face difficult votes, perhaps as early as tomorrow. We have approached the cusp of these vital and historic votes. Many of these votes will be difficult for my colleagues. But as difficult as they are for them—and for many whose difficulty I respect—let's remember how difficult it has been for those families of the victims to come here to look you in the eye as they have done and say: Let's now do something about gun violence. That is what I heard in the wake of Newtown, as early as the evening that horrific tragedy occurred. Let's do something about the guns.

We have the opportunity to do something about the guns. As Gabby Giffords said to the Judiciary Committee just weeks ago: Be bold. Be courageous. America is counting on you.

That is her urging to us. That is our obligation and our historic opportunity.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING BRITISH PRIME MINISTER BARONESS MARGARET THATCHER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution that is at the desk honoring the life, legacy, and example of British Prime Minister Baroness Margaret Thatcher.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 98) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we have just agreed to a resolution honoring the late Margaret Thatcher before her funeral tomorrow. It is our intention for that resolution to be a statement equal to her legacy. Her work with Ronald Reagan reinvigorated the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Margaret Thatcher was one of the most influential and revolutionary figures of the 20th century, and failing to name her achievements would do her memory and legacy a great disservice. It would be unheard of to commemorate Churchill, for example, and ignore his heroic role in steering his countrymen through the Battle of Britain, nor would we think of honoring Lincoln without mentioning the Civil War. Doing the right thing when it is not easy or popular is what defines leadership, and it defined Margaret Thatcher. It is fitting that the Senate honored her legacy just a few moments ago.

Margaret Thatcher didn't just change a country or give people hope, she helped alter the course of history. It is true that she did not just go along to get along. Had she done so, I am sure we would have long since forgotten her.

Let's honor her for all she did. Let's acknowledge the enormity of what she accomplished. Let's mention her achievements by name, and the resolution does that. As I said, we owe Margaret Thatcher a tribute equal to her legacy.

SAFE COMMUNITIES, SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 2013—Continued

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I rise today as a mother, a grandmother, and a Senator—a Senator whose State has been touched far too many times by gun violence, including mass shootings. I also wish to reiterate my support for the people of Boston who are dealing with the aftermath of senseless, tragic, and cowardly violence.

I think I need to put into context why I have for so long been an advocate of gun safety measures. In January 1989, a gunman stepped onto the grounds of Cleveland Elementary School in Stockton, CA. He fired at least 106 bullets from an AK-47 rifle across the schoolyard. He killed 5 children, ages 6 to 9, and 1 teacher, and he injured 29 other students before fatally shooting himself. This horrific crime led California to enact an assault weapons ban and, of course, we know that assault weapons ban in California is still in place. I so appreciate Senator FEINSTEIN's leadership in trying to, once again, authorize at the Federal level an assault weapons ban.

Californians still remember this tragedy in Stockton, just as the Nation will always remember the victims of the horrific events of Friday, December 14, 2012, at Sandy Hook Elementary School.

I flash forward to from 1989 and the Stockton tragedy to a law office in San Francisco in 1993, where a crazed gunman—I remember his name, but I will not say it—with an assault weapon killed eight people and wounded six. One of those people was a brave lawyer who threw his body over the body of his wife, sacrificing his own life to save hers. That young man was one of my son's best friends, and I know personally how these horrific and senseless tragedies live on with the survivors—the parents, the spouses, the children, the families, and the friends. It changes their lives and it pierces their hearts forever.

I have told you a couple of stories about California. But let me say this: Let's look at what has happened across this Nation since Sandy Hook. In the 120 days since Sandy Hook, more than 2,200 Americans have been killed by gun violence. Hardly any place was spared.

We know there are many, many firearms in America. There are 300 million firearms in the United States. If you were to divide that up, that would be one gun per person, of course. There are many people who have many, many guns.

This is a 50-percent increase—the number of guns in circulation—since 1995, when there were, as I say, about half that number.

When I go home and I speak about this—and I write about it—I say: There are 31,000 reasons why we need to pass sensible gun laws because—31,000—that is the number of people who die every year in America from gun violence. That is 87 people every single day, on average.

You look at this: 31,000 people dying every year from gun violence. So how do you get a sense of what that is? I think back. One of the reasons I got into politics in the first place was the war in Vietnam and trying to end it, first as an activist and then, actually, as an elected leader in my country. I think about how many people died in the 10-year war of Vietnam and it was

a little bit more than 50,000 in that 10-year period and it turned our country upside down—upside down. I can tell you, I lived through it: generation against generation. It was a very tough time in this Nation. People lost faith in the country. It was tough.

Yet we have 31,000 people killed every year in America from gun violence, and it is something where we all kind of just say: OK, that is terrible, but we do not do anything about it. But we are about to do something about it that is very important. It may not be everything I would want to do, given my history on this issue, but I will say, if we can move forward with sensible background checks—and I thank Senators MANCHIN and TOOMEY so much, so much, for their work—and if we can do something about straw purchasers, and if we can do something about making our schools safer—which I am pleased to say I wrote the legislation that is in the underlying bill before us—if we can do a few of these things, it would be a big step forward.

Do I want to see more done? Yes. Do I want to see the ban on assault weapons reinstated? I do. But I do feel we are at a point in time where we may be able to get something done that matters.

I think we ought to look at mass shootings in the last 30 years. First of all, 40 percent of mass shootings have occurred since 2006. So if you go back 30 years, you see 40 percent took place since 2006.

According to the Washington Post, in 2012 alone, 175 people were killed or wounded from mass shootings. People who should not get these weapons are getting these weapons. People with severe mental illness are getting these weapons. We know that.

Today, we got to see in the Democratic Caucus lunch a heroine, someone who is unbelievable, Gabby Giffords, struggle with each step, with every word. Why? What did she do? She held a townhall meeting so she could bring government to her people in the most personal of ways. And someone who was very sick got access to weapons, and the rest we know.

In the name of those who were lost, Gabby Giffords and her husband Mark Kelly have been truth-tellers. These people—Mark and Gabby—are gun owners, proud gun owners. They are not coming from a different place. Yet they are standing for sensible gun laws. I am so grateful to them for dedicating their lives to this, and I am so grateful to the parents of the children and all the victims at Sandy Hook for putting a human face on these numbers.

Madam President, 175—what does that mean? If you saw the faces you would know what it means. And sometimes the wounds, as we see with Gabby, are so hard to deal with.

We can make it harder for people who are criminals, who have no right to have a gun, we can make it harder for them by making sure they have to undergo a background check.

Today, I learned from Mark Kelly that we, through the background checks that we already have—that is when people go to a regular retail store—we have stopped well over a million gun sales, well over. Yet we do not have that same system in place for gun shows or private sales.

So JOE MANCHIN and Senator TOOMEY have been working together, and they have crafted a way to move toward a sensible background check—yes, protecting family members who want to give a gun to the next, but they have preserved, the most important part of their bill, which is to simply make a uniform standard for a gun sale wherever you purchase your gun.

Some of the strongest proponents of this are people who run retail stores who go through the laborious situation—although it is pretty quick now—of doing a background check. Yet somebody can go across the street to a gun show and make a deal and never be asked, and they could be a criminal, they could be mentally unbalanced, they could be a terrorist, OK, and still get a gun.

I want to look at the issue of school shootings in America. The tragedy that took place at Sandy Hook is a tragedy that far too many of our Nation's communities have faced in recent years.

I have in the Chamber a chart that shows that since the year of Columbine, 262 students, teachers, and others have been killed or wounded in K-12 school shootings. People go to school. It is supposed to be a protected zone. Who thinks about this? Look how many people since Columbine. And we swore we would never allow that to happen again. It is happening. So we have to do more.

I tell you, this is just K-12. But if you look at America's colleges and universities, in my own State, at California's Oikos University, in 2012—it is in Oakland—a former student returned to the campus and killed seven people and injured three. We have these horrible violent incidents at colleges and universities.

School shootings are on the rise in America. I am telling you. I have the numbers to show it on this chart. Divided up by decades, we go back. From 1979 to 1988—this is the number of incidents at schools; not the people killed, but the number of school shootings—there were 27. This is just for K-12. This does not include the universities. So for K-12, from 1979 to 1988, 27 incidents; from 1989 to 1998, 55 incidents; from 1999 to 2008, 66 incidents.

This is a number we do not want to keep going up. In so many of these cases it could have been prevented. I am not saying every case, but certainly in some cases. If we were able to do something about the magazine capacity here, that would have a big impact on the numbers as well. So we are moving up, and that is not a good number.

The parents of the fallen children at Sandy Hook and Oikos in my home State have joined countless other par-

ents who have lost their children in violent assaults on our Nation's schools and colleges. They have joined with parents of Colorado's Columbine High School, California's Santana High School, Minnesota's Red Lake Senior High School, West Nickel Mines School in Pennsylvania, Virginia Tech, and so many others.

The shooting at Sandy Hook is another reminder that we have failed our children. I do not know how to put it another way. I am so sad about it. This topic is so heavy in my heart because I know we can do some things to change it. I believe we are on the brink of doing some things—not enough in my view but some things to change it.

I could tell you, Madam President—because the Presiding Officer was there today—we had quite a caucus today. Our colleagues who stood up, who have seen these tragedies in their States, were beyond eloquent. Our colleagues—who are trying to do something that, yes, may be politically difficult—are showing courage.

It is one of those moments when you say: I am blessed to be here, and I can do something about this. I think more and more of our colleagues are beginning to realize this, as they meet with the parents and they meet with colleagues and they sit down one-on-one.

We have to keep our children safe.

One of the pieces of legislation that is less controversial that is included in the base bill before us is the School and Campus Safety Enhancements Act that I have authored with Senator COLLINS, Senator WARNER, and Senator KIRK to help secure our Nation's schools.

For years, we had the very successful Secure Our Schools program. Basically, we build from that program and we make some changes to it that I think will make it better.

I want to explain the way it would work. What we say is, if a local entity—and this could be a police department; it could be school districts—if they feel they want to secure their schools, they will have to put some funds on the line, about 50 percent of the funding. But we would supplement that funding by 50 percent. We would help to pay for security-related capital improvements at the school plant.

A lot of our schools are old. When they were built, no one thought 5 seconds about some of these issues. Classroom locks, lighting, fencing, reinforced doors, security assessments, training for students and teachers and administrators, coordination with local law enforcement—there are so many things we can do. But we know our school districts and our local police departments are stretched right now.

We want to help them pay for some of these things—perimeter fencing, for example, and cameras. You could see someone coming onto the campus and take action to either alert your school officers who may be there or your local police department to prepare.

We have had a similar program in place since 2002, but the authorization

expired in 2009. In the past, 5,500 schools have received these funds, but the funds were not even sufficient. Fifty-four percent of the entities that applied for these grants were turned away. So we know this is a program the schools like because they took advantage of it. But we ran out of funds. We want to make sure we reauthorize this. In the past, programs such as the one in the bill passed with a 307-to-1 vote in the House and the Senate 95 to 0.

What we do is reauthorize the Safety in Schools Program for 10 years. We increase the authorization to \$40 million a year. We allow more flexibility. We do not say what they have to use it for. By the way, they do not use it for more cops in schools. That is another issue. It is not in this particular piece. It is something I care about and want to work on. It is not in this bill.

What is in this bill is making capital improvements to the facilities. It is not a one-size-fits-all. Some people do not need a fence or a camera or a door. We leave it up to the schools. Flexibility. We also do something Senator WARNER truly wanted. We create a Department of Justice and Department of Education task force to develop advisory school safety guidelines. We include language from Senator GRASSLEY to ensure adequate grant accountability. Senator WARNER and Senator KIRK also wanted to create a National Center for Campus Public Safety, which will serve as a clearinghouse for education, training, and best practices. Here is the thing. Some of our campuses know how to do this and others do not. So we want to make sure there is a central place one can find out the best practices.

I was going to go through, in closing, some of the ways these funds were actually used on the ground before this program expired. In Sulphur Springs, TX, which is a school district made up of nine schools, they wanted to do a safety assessment. They were able to make that safety assessment so they knew what they had to do to make their schools safer.

When they did their study, they found they needed to replace older security equipment and technology, expand restricted access keyway systems, and placed classroom security levers on all doors, which allowed teachers to lock doors from the inside. Simple point. You may say: Oh, that is not expensive. Why do you need to spend money? It sure adds up when you truly want to secure a door and want to do it right. So if you have many doors, we can help them do these things. If they wanted to make sure they hardened their facility, that is what the money is for.

There is a township in New Jersey that used funds to secure perimeter and playground areas by installing security gates at elementary and intermediate schools to create a safer learning environment. The new exterior fences defined school boundaries, mak-

ing the school grounds safer for students. Interior gates were placed at schools, providing the ability to lock off specific areas of the schools during emergencies.

Again, it is common sense. But when these schools were built, no one thought about this. Everything was open. It is similar to the Capitol when I came here. I am dating myself. A long time ago, you could go anywhere—no metal detectors, no fences, walk up the steps to the Capitol. We have lost a lot of that freedom. Our world is now to balance our freedom in the greatest country in the world with security. That is what we are trying to do with this.

In Minnesota, we saw grants used to conduct security assessments and institute safety training classes. In Palmer High School in Colorado, they implemented a new surveillance, lockdown, and evacuation procedure. They doubled the number of doors that are operated by security cards, so it reduced the number of outside individuals able to gain building entry. It makes it harder for people to get in. It might be annoying for some parents, but I think right now people realize this is what is needed. It is this balance.

In Florida, in Leon County, which is responsible for 50 schools, they had no central point of contact to coordinate communication across all school facilities. So they set up, with the funds from this program, a 24-hour emergency operations center which has significantly reduced emergency response time. There is one point of contact.

So what we have done in this bill is not a one-size-fits-all. We do not say in here: You have to do 10 things. We say: You come up with the plan. You send it to the Department of Justice. They look at the plan. They work with you to make it good. If they think it is worthwhile, we will fund it 50 percent.

My final point. I want to show who supports school safety provisions in the bill: Fraternal Order of Police, Security Industry Association, National Sheriff's Association, National Association of School Resource Officers, International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators.

I ask unanimous consent to have the list printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW ENFORCEMENT AND SECURITY INDUSTRY GROUPS

Fraternal Order of Police, National Sheriffs Association, National Association of School Resource Officers, International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators, International Union of Police Associations, Security Industry Association, Texas State University's Advanced Law Enforcement Rapid Response Training Center (ALERRT).

PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND ADMINISTRATORS

National Parent Teacher Association, National School Board Association, National Education Association, American Association of School Administrators, National As-

sociation of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Rural Education Advocacy Coalition, Association of Educational Service Agencies, National Rural Education Association, Virginia Tech Victims Family Outreach Foundation, American Association of University Women.

Mrs. BOXER. I have left out PTAs, National School Board Association, the NEA, and so on. We have a long list.

Look, we will never be able to stand here and say we have solved every problem. We cannot. But we have to be able to say, we have to be able to know we did everything we could to reduce these tragedies. As I stand here I think, what will people say who do not vote for this and the next tragedy comes? What will they say? How can they look at their kids and their grandkids and say: I did not think it was right.

We need to do commonsense things around here, not put ideology ahead of practicality. The slaughter of innocents must stop. I am going to support the Toomey-Manchin amendment. It closes the gun show and Internet loophole. It is not the perfect background check I would write. We know that. But it is good. It is solid. It moves forward. I am going to support Senator LEAHY—his amendment which will outlaw the abusive practice of straw purchasing and gun trafficking. I will support Senator FEINSTEIN's important amendment on assault weapons, to ban those weapons. She has worked so hard to make it fair and just and right. It would also take high-capacity clips off our streets.

Senator FEINSTEIN will have much more to say on assault weapons. I will withhold my remarks on that until that debate. Clearly, we have work to do. Clearly, we all carry from our State and in our hearts stories of this violence. Now we have a moment in time where we can actually act. I truly appreciate this opportunity.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 6 p.m. be for debate only; that at 6 p.m. the Senate recess subject to the call of the chair; that when the Senate reconvenes the majority leader be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET THATCHER

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise to honor the memory of Margaret

Thatcher. When she passed, the United States lost a great ally and the world lost one of the greatest champions of liberty who has ever lived. I commend our colleague Senator MITCH MCCONNELL for today offering a resolution that was approved by unanimous consent praising Thatcher's leadership. I commend all 100 Senators for consenting to and adopting that resolution.

I would like to spend a brief amount of time talking about the incredible import of Margaret Thatcher's legacy. Margaret Thatcher became familiar to so many of us in the United States after she started winning elections. We think of her as the scourge of the Socialist policies that threatened to ruin Britain, as the resolute victor of the Falklands War, and, of course, as the ideological soulmate of President Ronald Reagan, who battled the Soviets.

I have always been fond of her admonition that conservatives need to first "win the argument," then we will win the vote; in other words, that we need to effectively communicate our ideas in order to prevail in elections, and elections will naturally follow as the consequence of doing so.

I would like to talk about her days winning the argument, in particular, her seminal speech on January 19, 1976, entitled "Britain Awake." At the time, it seemed to many that the conservative movement had failed. As James Callaghan succeeded Harold Wilson as the Labor Prime Minister, the Tories were in apparent disarray.

Thatcher had wrested control of the party from former Prime Minister Edward Heath. Few gave her a chance at broader electoral success. Indeed, she said at the time she did not anticipate a female Prime Minister in her lifetime. I would be remiss if I did not note Margaret Thatcher was Britain's first and, to date, only female Prime Minister.

Thatcher was a trailblazer, and her ascension wasn't simply a matter of breaking the glass ceiling as much as it was refusing to acknowledge its existence.

Thatcher made the argument in that 1976 speech. She began by observing:

The first duty of any Government is to safeguard its people against external aggression. To guarantee the survival of our way of life.

She then addressed the Soviet menace, noting: "They put guns before butter, while we put just about everything before guns." She bluntly and truthfully said the Soviets were "a failure in human and economic terms."

She went on to tell the nation: "The advance of Communist power threatens our whole way of life."

However, she stated:

That advance is not irreversible, providing that we take the necessary measures now. But the longer that we go on running down our means of survival, the harder it will be to catch up.

These comments strikingly were echoed not long after by President

Ronald Reagan, when he spoke so clearly and addressed the Soviet Union as an evil empire. He went on to observe that Marxism would end up discarded on the ash heap of history.

At the time Margaret Thatcher's comments and Ronald Reagan's comments were derided by much of the intelligentsia, the media, the academy, and by many observers who knew far better than these seemingly naive souls. They were derided when President Reagan was asked: What is your philosophy of the Cold War? He responded: It is very simple. "We win, they lose." This was seen as a simple Manichean view of the world and not realistic. Yet I would suggest their vision ushered in a far safer day for humanity.

Margaret Thatcher laid out the stark decision before the nation.

There are moments in our history when we have to make a fundamental choice. This is one such moment—a moment where our choice will determine the life or death of our kind of society—and the future of our children. Let's ensure that our children will have cause to rejoice that we did not forsake their freedom.

Margaret Thatcher won the argument. She took office during Britain's "winter of discontent" when Britain had double-digit inflation, a top income tax rate of 83 percent, and rising unemployment. She revolutionized the economy with free market ideas in her 10 years of service which ushered in a new decade of prosperity.

When she took office, the top income tax rate was 83 percent. It was cut to 60 percent and then to 40 percent. The middle tax rate was cut to 30 percent, and the lowest tax rate was eliminated altogether.

When she took office, the top corporate tax rate was 53 percent. She cut it to 35 percent. The top capital gains tax rate was a stifling 75 percent. Thatcher cut it to 30 percent. As a result of progrowth policies, unemployment fell from a high of 12 percent early in her tenure to 7.5 percent near the end. Public spending as a percentage of GDP fell from 45.1 percent of GDP to 39.4 percent of GDP. Inflation fell from almost 22 percent in 1979 to a low rate of 2.4 percent in 1986.

Perhaps the most telling tribute to Margaret Thatcher's leadership is 3 days after she gave her "Britain Awake" speech, the heroic fearless speech, she was dubbed "The Iron Lady" in the Communist news outlet, the Red Star.

When your military enemies are describing you as formidable as "The Iron Lady," it indicates you are winning the argument, that your message is being heard.

Margaret Thatcher wasn't great just because she gave a good speech. She became great because she explained what was at stake. She articulated the meaning of economic freedom, freedom which allowed someone such as she, a shopkeeper's daughter, to rise to prosperity and leadership.

She articulated the value of national pride and convinced the public of the virtue of standing for freedom and against tyranny and oppression.

As Baroness Margaret Thatcher lays down the tortured freedom she spoke of in 1976, we can pay no higher tribute to her than to heed her arguments which are as valid today as they were then.

It is unfortunate news accounts have indicated the U.S. Government will not be sending a member of the current administration to her funeral tomorrow. I hope those news accounts are mistaken.

I hope President Obama, Vice President BIDEN or senior Members of the Cabinet make the decision to travel to Britain and to honor the incredible legacy of Baroness Margaret Thatcher. It was truly a providential blessing Margaret Thatcher served alongside President Ronald Reagan and Pope John Paul II. Together, the three of them did something which previously had been unimaginable.

So many had opined the Cold War was unwinnable. We had to accept detente. We had to accept a condition in which the United States would constantly be in military conflict with the Soviet Union and our children would constantly be in fear of potential catastrophic nuclear war.

Yet when Reagan, Thatcher, and Pope John Paul all ascended to leadership together, they had the vision to do something very few imagined was possible, to win the Cold War without firing a shot.

Had that been suggested in the 1970s, this would have been diminished as crazy talk. Yet this is precisely what they did. Indeed, I would suggest in modern times there are few, if any, more deserving of the Nobel Peace Prize than those three leaders whose vision, courage, and collective leadership transformed the global debate and ended the Cold War which jeopardized the very fate of humanity. There have been no other leaders in modern time more deserving of recognition of a prize such as the Nobel Peace Prize than the three leaders who avoided war without firing a shot.

Today, many of us are the children of the generation which fought and won the Cold War. We can gratefully rejoice that Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan and Pope John Paul II did not forsake our freedom.

As the children of those great leaders, it is now incumbent upon us, the next generation, to ensure freedom remains every bit as vital and real, not just for this generation but for our children and their children's children.

Baroness Margaret Thatcher was an extraordinary leader and courageous leader, a woman of vision, a woman of principle, and a hero—a hero to the United States and to the world. All of us, in my judgment, are in her debt.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, let me begin by offering my deepest condolences on behalf of all the people of Maryland for the 20 students and 6 adults who lost their lives at the hands of a single shooter at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, CT, on December 14, 2012. Some of the victims put themselves in harm's way in order to save the lives of children, true heroes.

We have an obligation to the Sandy Hook families to seize this moment, set our political fears aside, and act responsibly. America has more than 3,300 victims of gun violence nationwide since the shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary in Newtown, CT. Each heart-breaking event is shocking in its own right but also tears us apart, wondering what could we have done to prevent this from happening.

I am proud the Senate has come together to engage in a real debate on what steps should be taken to minimize the risk of future shootings.

The safety of our children and communities should never be put at risk by partisan gridlock. I agree with President Obama. We cannot wait for another tragedy to enact commonsense, reasonable gun safety measures, especially on weapons of war which have no legitimate civilian use.

I am sympathetic to the interests of legitimate hunters and collectors, but we should reinstate the Federal ban on assault weapons. We should also prohibit high-capacity ammunition clips which hold more than 10 rounds at a time. We must take steps together to strengthen our mental health system, make our schools safer, crack down on gun traffickers, straw purchasers, and reduce the glorification of violence in our culture.

The elimination of assault weapons in our community would have minimal or no impact on legitimate hunters or legitimate gun owners, but it could save lives. Listen to what law enforcement says. They don't think it is a fair fight when they have to go up against a criminal who has an assault weapon. The criminal has the advantage. We should support law enforcement and get assault weapons off the street.

Listen to the accounts of the massacres we have seen when the perpetrators had these clips with so many rounds of ammunition. At Sandy Hook, they went into a classroom and used the number of bullets which were in that round to massacre children. This was tragic. The consequences could have been different if these large ammunition clips were not available. It could save lives.

Dealing with mental health issues, dealing with school safety issues, dealing with straw purchase purchases, all

that could keep these weapons out of the hands of those who should not have these weapons, the types of weapons which caused these massive killings.

I support universal background checks for all firearms buyers as proposed by Senator SCHUMER. I congratulate my colleagues, Senators MANCHIN and TOOMEY, for coming to a bipartisan consensus on strengthening the current background check system.

The background check proposals for the first time would require background checks for all gun sales in commercial settings, including at gun shows, Internet, and in classified ads. I believe this legislation will keep guns out of the hands of convicted felons, domestic abusers, and seriously mentally ill who have no business buying a gun. Studies have shown nearly half of all current gun sales are made by private sellers who are exempt from conducting background checks.

It makes no sense that felons, fugitives, and others who are legally prohibited from having a gun can so easily use a loophole to buy a gun. Once again, the use of a universal background check will have no impact on the legitimate needs of people who are entitled to have weapons, but it could and would help us keep our communities safe by keeping weapons out of the hands of our criminals who have serious mental illness, domestic abusers. We need to stop their ability to easily obtain weapons as they do today.

This legislation strengthens the National Instant Criminal Background Check System by incentivizing States to improve their reporting system and removing certain barriers to the submission of critical mental health records.

This legislation also makes it easier for Active-Duty military personnel to buy guns in States where they live and are stationed for duty. It clarifies people traveling across State lines may carry guns which are locked and unloaded.

It is heartbreaking to listen to stories of innocent lives cut cruelly short. The pain and grief of families and friends of these students and teachers is unimaginable. We know that teachers and the aides put their lives on the line to try to save children, and that first responders coming to the scene had the unbelievable task of not knowing what they would find. We send our prayers to all, but we have to do more than just say words. We are going to be judged by our deeds, and we have a chance to take action that will be helpful.

This is a tragedy beyond words. I think President Obama said it best when he said that our hearts are broken. Congress needs to come together and take action to protect the safety of our children. We must do better. There have been too many episodes in which children's lives and others have been lost. We must figure out a way to prevent these types of tragedies.

I am pleased the State of Maryland has recently taken action in the gen-

eral assembly session that concluded last week. Governor O'Malley recommended legislation adopted by the Maryland General Assembly that bans assault weapons, limits the capacity of magazine clips from 20 to 10, and increases restrictions on the possession of firearms and ammunition by convicted criminals and those with mental health disqualifications.

The President was correct to take executive action to strengthen and enhance our gun safety laws, but now it is time for Congress to act. The victims of gun violence deserve to have Congress take an up-or-down vote on these issues.

To my colleagues who have reservations about this legislation, let me cite the Heller decision. In June 2008 the Supreme Court decided the District of Columbia v. Heller. The Court held that the Second Amendment protects individuals rather than a collective right to possess a firearm. The Court also held the Second Amendment right is not unlimited, and it is not a right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever in any manner and for any purpose. Justice Scalia wrote for the Court in that case, and I am going to quote Justice Scalia:

... nothing in our opinion should be taken to cast doubt on the longstanding prohibitions on the possession of firearms by felons and the mentally ill, or laws forbidding the carrying of firearms in sensitive places such as schools and government buildings, or laws imposing conditions and qualifications on the commercial sale of arms.

Justice Scalia recognized Congress's right, and I would say obligation, to make sure those who are not qualified to own a firearm do not get that firearm. We have an obligation to make sure that background checks are effective so as to keep out of the hands of criminals and those who have serious mental health issues the opportunity to easily obtain a firearm, as they can in many States today.

The legislation pending before the Senate is in full consistency with the Heller decision and the language of Justice Scalia's opinion for the Court. I know we can protect children while still protecting the constitutional rights of legitimate hunters and existing gun owners. We should take that action on behalf of the safety of our communities. It is our obligation to act.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, we are gathered in the Senate in the somber shadow of the events in Boston at the marathon, and I guess I will start by conveying my sympathies to the individuals and their families who were killed or hurt in that terrible act. I share the determination of so many people that our law enforcement folks will indeed get to the bottom of this; that they will get the resources they need, and we will have answers

and justice for the families who are affected.

CLIMATE CHANGE

I rise today, though, on the subject I come to the floor every week we are in session to discuss, which is the need for this body to wake up to the reality of the clear scientific consensus that human activity is driving serious changes in our climate and oceans.

For more than two decades the fossil fuel companies and certain rightwing extremists have cooked up a well-organized campaign to call into question the scientific evidence of climate change. The paid-for deniers then manufacture an interesting product—they manufacture uncertainty—so the polluters who are doing the paying can also keep polluting because a sufficient atmosphere of uncertainty has been created to inhibit progress.

This is not a new strategy. We have seen this played before. Industries eager to drown out scientific evidence to maximize profit is not a new story. They questioned the merits of requiring seatbelts in automobiles, they questioned the toxic effects of lead exposure, and they questioned whether tobacco was really bad for people. Well, they were wrong then and they are wrong now about climate.

Interestingly, they do not actually care. It is not their purpose to be accurate; they just want to create doubt, to sow enough of a question to stop progress. So these sophisticated campaigns are launched to give the public the false impression there actually is a real scientific debate over climate change. In the Senate, regrettably, some of my colleagues even promote this view.

But let's be practical. Which is the more likely case: Are a handful of non-profit environmental groups using their limited funding to pay off literally hundreds and hundreds of climate scientists in an internationally coordinated hoax to falsify complicated climate research? Really? Or is it more likely that fossil fuel corporations are using a slice of their immense profits to float front groups to protect their immense profits? Well, I think the answer to that question is obvious just from the logic, but we don't have to apply logic. We can follow the money and look at evidence.

According to an analysis by the Checks and Balances Project, a self-described pro-clean-energy government and industry watchdog group, from 2006 to 2010, four sources of fossil fuel money—just four of them—contributed more than \$16 million to a group of conservative think tanks that go about the business of being publicly critical of climate science and of clean energy. Those four sources are the Charles G. Koch Foundation, the Claude R. Lambe Charitable Foundation, the Earhart Foundation, and oil giant ExxonMobil.

On the receiving end is a lengthy roster of well-known and often-cited right-ward leaning outfits. We will just talk about the top 10 in this set of re-

marks. They are the American Enterprise Institute, the Cato Institute, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the Heartland Institute, the Heritage Foundation, the Hudson Institute, the Institute for Energy Research, the George C. Marshall Institute, the Manhattan Institute, and the Mercatus Center.

Who is giving? Well, Charles Koch is the chairman and CEO of Koch Industries and the sixth richest person on the planet. Koch Industries is the second largest privately held company in the United States of America. Koch companies include the Koch Pipeline Company and Flint Hills Resources, which operates refineries with a combined crude oil processing capacity of more than 292 million barrels per year. That much oil accounts for 126 million metric tons of carbon pollution each year—as much as 35 coal-fired powerplants produce or 26 million cars.

So to put it mildly, this fellow has some skin in the game. Between 2006 and 2010, the Charles G. Koch Foundation gave almost \$8 million to think tanks and institutes, including \$7.6 million to the Mercatus Center, and \$100,000 to the American Enterprise Institute.

Charles Koch, along with his brother David, also established the Claude R. Lambe Charitable Foundation—those two have the same source—and they direct that foundation's giving as well. This foundation provided almost \$5 million to climate-denying think tanks and institutes, including over \$1 million to the Cato Institute and more than \$2 million to the Heritage Foundation.

The Earhart Foundation was started by Henry Boyd Earhart, using funds from his oil business, White Star Refining Company—now a part of, you guessed it, ExxonMobil. The Earhart Foundation has donated almost \$1.5 million to climate denier groups, \$370,000 to the American Enterprise Institute, \$330,000 to the Cato Institute, and another \$195,000 to the George C. Marshall Institute.

That leaves us, of course, ExxonMobil itself, which is the second largest corporation in the world and often the most profitable. Ranked No. 1 among Fortune 500 companies, its total revenues reached nearly \$½ trillion in 2012, and their profits were nearly \$45 billion. ExxonMobil produces over 6 million barrels of oil per day at its 36 refineries in 20 countries. So it is the world's largest oil producer. From 2006 to 2010, the petroleum giant gave institutes more than \$2.3 million: \$1.2 million to the American Enterprise Institute, \$220,000 to the Heritage Foundation, \$160,000 to the Institute for Energy Research, and \$115,000 for the Heartland Institute.

So what did the Charles G. Koch Foundation and the Claude R. Lambe Charitable Foundation and the Earhart Foundation and ExxonMobil get for all of that so-called charitable giving? Well, the Checks and Balances Project

found from 2007 to 2011 the 10 organizations I cited—the top 10—were quoted or cited or had articles published over 1,000 times—over 1,000 times—in 60 mainstream newspapers and print publications, and invariably they were promoting fossil fuels, undermining renewable energy, or attacking environmental policies.

That is good investing—spend millions of dollars on a handful of think tanks to protect billions of dollars in profits. Really, it is a 1,000-to-1 return. But here is the problem. The public is unaware of the connection usually. Only a handful of these attacks were accompanied by any explanation by the media the fossil fuel industry was involved in them.

Here is one prime example: Last summer, when the Navy displayed its great green fleet, a carrier strike group that runs on a 50-50 blend of biodiesel and petroleum, Institute for Energy Research president Thomas Kyl wrote a column for U.S. News and World Report calling that initiative “ridiculous” and “a costly and pointless exercise.” Never mind for a moment our defense and intelligence communities have repeatedly warned of the threats posed by climate change to national security and international stability and of their own need to secure a reliable and secure fuel supply.

What is misleading is that the U.S. News and World Report in publishing that article attributed the column simply thus, “Thomas Pyle is the president of the Institute for Energy Research,” with no mention the Institute for Energy Research is a front for big donors such as the Claude R. Lambe Charitable Foundation and ExxonMobil.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The problem is that this is one example of a misleading practice that is the norm in the media. More than half of the time, media outlets do nothing more than state the name of the publishing organization, such as “Thomas Pyle and the Institute for Energy Research,” or they may add a functional description such as “think tank” or “nonpartisan group.”

The instances where the publication described the basic ideology of the group—for example, as a “free market” or “conservative” think tank—amount to less than one-third. In all of the media outlets reviewed between 2007 and 2011, the financial ties between the authors and the fossil fuel industry were mentioned a mere 6 percent of the time. Ninety-four percent of the time, the fossil fuel industry funders got away with it.

This chart shows some of the examples. The Washington Post ignored the financial connection 88 percent of the time, Politico ignored the financial

connection 95 percent of the time, the Christian Science Monitor ignored it every time, USA TODAY ignored it 98 percent of the time, and the New York Times ignored it 90 percent of the time. So the scam of laundering money through independent-sounding organizations works. The media lets it work. The vast majority of scientists agree that global warming is occurring, but a recent Gallup Poll revealed that only 62 percent of Americans believe that the vast majority of scientists agree that global warming is occurring.

Well over 90 percent of scientists agree that climate change is happening and that humans are the main cause. The only uncertainty is about how bad it is going to be, and the leading research predicts warmer air and seas, rising sea levels, stronger storms, and more acidic oceans.

Most major players in the private sector actually get it. While the big fossil fuel polluters try to confuse the public in order to boost their bottom line and prolong their pollution, hundreds of leading corporations understand that climate change ultimately undermines our entire economy. Let me mention some of the examples: the Ford Motor Company; Coca-Cola; GE; Walmart; the insurance giant Munich Re; Alcoa, the great aluminum maker; Maersk; Procter & Gamble; FedEx; and the so-called BICEP group, which includes eBay, Intel, Starbucks, Adidas, and Nike.

This notion that this is a hoax, that there is doubt, is belied by some of the most respected names in the private sector. Those companies join the National Academies, they join NASA, they join the U.S. Department of Defense, the Government Accountability Office, the American Public Health Association, and, yes, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, as well as a majority of Americans in understanding that it is time to wake up, to end this faux controversy that has been cooked up by the fossil fuel industry, and to do the work in Congress that needs to be done to protect Americans from the harms of carbon pollution.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:04 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 7 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. DONNELLY).

SAFE COMMUNITIES, SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 2013—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I want to start off by saying I am deeply saddened by the tragedy in Boston. Franni's and my thoughts and prayers

are with everyone who has been affected.

Franni and I went to school in Boston. In fact, we met more than 43 years ago at a freshman mixer in Copley Square, so we know Boston. We have witnessed firsthand the kind of compassion and resilience we have seen from Bostonians, and I have faith we will find whoever did this and bring that person or those persons to justice.

Mr. President, I came to the floor today to speak in support of the gun violence legislation we are considering. Since the tragedy in Newtown, we have been asking ourselves what we should do to address this problem of gun violence in our country.

My primary focus in the wake of Newtown has been on mental health. Improving the access to mental health care has been one of my top priorities since I came to the Senate, and I am glad people are beginning to focus more on the issue. If we are going to make mental health a part of this, let's make it more than just a talking point. Let's make it a true national priority. Let's really do something to improve access to treatment for folks who need it.

Since the first day I got here, I have been pushing the administration to issue the final regulations for the Wellstone-Domenici Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act, which requires insurance plans to cover mental health and addiction services and to do so to the same extent they cover medical and surgical services. Five years after that bill was signed into law, at long last the administration has promised to implement it, and to do so by the end of the year. I expect the administration to follow through on that commitment.

I have also introduced the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Act to help law enforcement officers respond to mental health crises in their communities and improve access to mental health treatment for people who end up in the criminal justice system. This is a bipartisan, bicameral bill that I have been working on since last year, well before the tragedy in Newtown.

In January I introduced the Mental Health in Schools Act which will improve children's access to mental health services. Catching these issues at an early age is very important. I met with some mothers from the Mounds View School District in Minnesota about this matter. Their children's lives, their own lives, and their families' lives were changed for the better because the kids got access to the mental health care they needed at an early age.

My bill has 17 cosponsors and key provisions have been included in a package which was recently reported out of the HELP Committee. I look forward to considering that legislation on the Senate floor soon. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

These are important measures, but let me be absolutely clear: The last

thing we need to do is stigmatize mental illness. I said this many times before, and I will say it again because it bears repeating, and it is very important to me: The vast majority of people with mental illness are no more violent than the general population. In fact, they are more frequently the victims of violence than others are.

There is a very small subset of those with serious mental illnesses who may become more violent if they are not diagnosed and treated, and that is the one place where this issue of mental health intersects with the issue of violence. Improving access to mental health care is all about improving people's lives. It is about helping people with mental illness and their families by making them happier and more productive people. However, today we are talking about gun violence prevention legislation.

People have strongly held views on both sides—or all sides—of this issue. Not only is that true in Minnesota, it is true throughout the country. Minnesota has a proud tradition, like Indiana, of responsible gun ownership.

We are home to many sportsmen and sportswomen. Generations of Minnesotans have learned to hunt pheasants, deer, and ducks from their parents, their grandparents, their aunts and uncles, friends and neighbors. We cherish our traditions and our Second Amendment right to bear arms for collection, protection, and sport.

Minnesota has both urban and rural areas. It is home to moms, dads, teachers, law enforcement officers, and health care providers too. We have members of the National Rifle Association and members of the Brady Campaign Against Gun Violence.

After the shooting at Sandy Hook, I reached out to my constituents. I got on the phone, I traveled across the State, I convened roundtables, I talked to hunters, school officials, law enforcement officers, and mental health experts. I wanted to hear Minnesotans' ideas, their hopes, their concerns, and their thoughts because it was and is important to me to approach this in a deliberative way.

Here is what I took away from these conversations: Minnesotans want us to take action to reduce gun violence and make our communities safer, but they want us to do it in a way that honors the Second Amendment and respects Minnesota's culture of responsible gun ownership. There is a balance to be struck there.

The overwhelming majority of gun owners are law-abiding citizens who responsibly use their guns for recreation and self-protection. Their concern should not be dismissed or trivialized. Their rights should not be undermined because of the horrible acts of just a few. So I suggest that our goal should be to take whatever steps we can to reduce gun violence and improve public safety without unduly burdening law-abiding, responsible gun owners. I believe that is what the Safe Communities, Safe Schools Act, the Manchinn-

Toomey amendment, and the assault weapons ban do.

First, we need to improve the Nation's background check system, and we need to strengthen our laws to combat straw purchases and gun trafficking. This was one of the key recommendations I have taken away from my meeting with law enforcement leaders in Minnesota. I think background checks are the single most important thing we can do to save lives.

Today background checks are required only when a gun is sold by a federally licensed dealer. Background checks are used to determine whether a prospective buyer has a felony conviction, is a fugitive from the law, has a restraining order against him, or has a serious mental illness. The problem is that people who cannot pass a background check simply go to a gun show or go on the Internet or to the classified ads to get a gun instead, and that is exactly what they do.

By some estimates about 40 percent of all gun transactions are processed without a background check. This is like having two lines at the airport: one where people go through the security screening and one where they don't, and those passengers are the ones who choose which line they stand in. Would anyone feel comfortable on a plane if they knew that 40 percent of the passengers didn't go through the security check and they were the ones who chose not to go through the security check?

The Manchin-Toomey amendment will expand background checks to gun shows and other congressional transactions. These checks are not an undue burden. They can typically be conducted in a matter of minutes through NICS, the National Instant Criminal Background Check System. The amendment excludes certain exchanges, such as when a Minnesotan hands his gun down to his son or to her daughter.

The Manchin-Toomey amendment fixes another problem. We all know background checks are only as good as the database they use. The problem is that a lot of States are not submitting court documents and other records to NICS. The amendment will provide new incentives and penalties to make sure the States do a better job.

This law will work. Since we started administering instant background checks more than 1.7 million felons, fugitives, domestic abusers, and people with serious mental illnesses have been denied access to firearms—and that is under the system that exists today with all of its loopholes and flaws.

We have seen that women are less likely to be killed by an intimate partner in States that have expanded their own background check systems. And, look, about 90 percent of Americans want us to pass this measure—90 percent. This is not a Republican idea, it is not a Democratic idea, it is just a good idea.

I think it would be a remarkable failure of our democracy if we cannot get

this done. If we cannot get this done, I am afraid it is because we have relied on fears and falsehoods instead of on facts.

For instance, some have argued that an expanded background check system will result in a Federal gun registry, but Federal gun registries are banned under existing law and the legislation we are considering would not repeal or weaken that. In fact, the Manchin-Toomey amendment would strengthen the current prohibition on Federal gun registries.

The other argument we have heard is that we should not bother improving the background check system until we do a better job prosecuting those who cheat the background check system under current law. There is really no reason we cannot do both, enforce and improve the law. In fact, that is exactly what the legislation does.

This legislation expands the background check system and strengthens the penalties for straw purchasers and gun traffickers. So I strongly support these proposed improvements to the background check system and to our gun trafficking laws.

The Judiciary Committee also reported Senator FEINSTEIN's assault weapons ban to the Senate floor. The bill would ban the future manufacture of large-capacity magazines and certain weapons with military-style characteristics. This bill will not require anyone to forfeit a gun he or she already has.

We saw the damage assault weapons or large-capacity magazines can do at Newtown, Tucson, Aurora, and elsewhere. Here is what Milwaukee Police Chief Edward Flynn said about assault weapons at a recent Judiciary Committee hearing:

Assault weapons are built to inflict violence against humans. Their military characteristics are not merely cosmetic in nature. These weapons are designed for combat. They are designed to quickly, easily, and efficiently cause lethal wounds to humans.

We are not talking about just mass shootings. For instance, studies suggest that large-capacity magazines may be used in up to a quarter of all gun crimes and 41 percent of police murders.

I believe the assault weapons ban will make our communities safer without unduly interfering with the rights of responsible gun owners. I think the bill strikes an appropriate balance. Others disagree, and I respect their views, but there are a few arguments that have been advanced against the assault weapons ban that I wish to address.

The first argument we have heard against Senator FEINSTEIN's bill is that Justice Department studies have proved the assault weapons ban was ineffective. During our first hearing, a witness said: "Independent studies, including a study from the Clinton Justice Department, proved that ban had no impact on lowering crime." And others, including my colleagues, repeated this claim.

Well, I went back and looked at the studies. What they actually say—and they say it over and over—is that it was premature to draw definitive conclusions about the ban's effectiveness. Here is what they said:

It is premature to make definitive assessments on the ban's impact on gun violence. The effects of the [assault weapon and large-capacity magazine] ban have yet to be fully realized; therefore, we recommend continued study.

The ban's reauthorization or expiration could affect gunshot victimizations, but predictions are tenuous.

I could go on and on. The reports repeat this point time and time again. If anything, the Justice Department report suggests a ban would be effective. For example, they said: "It could conceivably prevent hundreds of gunshot victimizations annually and produce notable cost savings in medical care."

It is simply not possible to read those studies and honestly say they prove an assault weapons ban is ineffective.

Another argument we have heard against Senator FEINSTEIN's bill is it will undermine one's ability to defend oneself. But here is the thing: The record contains no evidence of a real case in which someone actually needed a large-capacity magazine or assault weapon for self-defense.

During our first hearing, a witness submitted many examples where guns were used in self-defense, but I have not seen any evidence that any one of those cases actually involved a weapon that would be banned under Senator FEINSTEIN's bill. At our last markup, one of my colleagues submitted some additional cases for the record, but, again, after reviewing that list, I am not persuaded an assault weapon or large-capacity magazine was needed for self-defense in any of those instances.

Rather than presenting real cases in which someone actually needed an assault weapon or a large-capacity magazine to defend oneself, opponents of Senator FEINSTEIN's bill instead asked us repeatedly to imagine hypothetical situations where these weapons were needed for self-defense.

Sure, I can imagine hypothetical cases, but I am not sure what value that holds, because I can also imagine someone using a large-capacity magazine or an assault weapon to massacre people at an elementary school or a movie theater or a supermarket parking lot. I can imagine these things because they really happened. That is the reality. And it is reality we should be talking about.

I asked Philadelphia Mayor Michael Nutter, the president of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, about this and he said: "This idea that these weapons are for self-defense is, based on our experience, completely absurd."

The final argument I wish to address is one of the most important. Some have argued a ban on assault weapons and large-capacity magazines is unconstitutional. The problem with the argument is it typically rests on the premise that the Second Amendment is absolute or unlimited.

For example, during our committee markup, one of my colleagues asked Senator FEINSTEIN whether she would “consider it constitutional for Congress to specify that the First Amendment shall apply only to the following books and shall not apply to the books that Congress has deemed outside the protection of the Bill of Rights?”

The point my colleague was trying to make, I think, is that banning certain guns is like banning certain speech, and that this ban would violate the Constitution. This line of argument assumes the Second Amendment is absolute and unlimited—that any new gun law necessarily is unconstitutional.

But one doesn't have to be a constitutional scholar to know that rights are not unlimited. In fact, my colleague's question actually makes that very point. There are books that are not protected by the First Amendment. The Bill of Rights does not protect libel. The Bill of Rights does not protect child pornography. One cannot yell “fire” in a crowded movie theater where there is no fire.

And, likewise, the Second Amendment does not protect the rights of everyone to carry whatever weapon he likes in anyplace he wishes for whatever purpose he desires. The Second Amendment does not entitle felons or fugitives or domestic abusers or people with serious mental illnesses to carry guns. It does not entitle Americans to own a fully automatic machine gun or a bazooka or to bear nuclear arms.

Here is what Justice Antonin Scalia said in the *Heller* decision:

Like most rights, the right secured by the Second Amendment is not unlimited. . . . The right is not a right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever in any manner whatsoever and for whatever purpose.

Senator DURBIN chaired a hearing on this issue in February. I was persuaded by Professor Lawrence Tribe's testimony. He examined the legislation and said: “I'm convinced that nothing under discussion in the Senate Judiciary Committee represents a threat to the Constitution or even comes close to violating the second amendment.” Remember, Professor Tribe has supported gun rights. He argued for an individual's right to bear arms many years before the *Heller* decision.

I was also persuaded by the DC Circuit Court of Appeals' analysis in *Heller II*. There, the Court examined the District of Columbia's assault weapons ban by asking a series of questions. First, to what extent does this law burden an individual's right to bear arms for lawful purposes? Second, how does that burden compare with the public's interest in implementing the ban? Finally, is the ban sufficiently well tailored to that public interest?

This is the sort of inquiry that is typical in constitutional cases, and I think it is appropriate in the Second Amendment context too. It is nuanced and principled, not absolutist. The constitutional question is not whether a law touches upon Second Amendment

interests at all. The question is whether the law unduly burdens those interests—whether it strikes an appropriate balance between the Second Amendment interests at stake and the public's interest in its safety. We don't have to choose between the Second Amendment and saving lives. That is a false choice.

The *Heller II* Court correctly concluded that the District of Columbia's law—their assault ban—struck an acceptable balance and upheld DC's ban on assault weapons and large-capacity magazines. In fact, every court that considered laws banning assault weapons and large-capacity magazines has upheld those laws as constitutional. I am confident Senator FEINSTEIN's bill will be upheld in the courts as well.

When my colleague began drawing comparisons to the First Amendment, I was reminded of what Justice Potter Stewart famously said of obscenity: “I know it when I see it.” The debate on this issue changed the day that gunman massacred 20 little children and 6 educators with an assault weapon and large-capacity magazines at an elementary school in Newtown. That was an obscenity. Americans knew it when they saw it.

I hope we will continue to debate these issues in the days ahead. Debate is important, especially when people feel so strongly on both sides of this issue. I respect those who hold different views, and I hope they respect mine.

As we debate this issue, I hope we keep in mind what Gabby Giffords, Miya and Sam Rahamin, and Neil Heslin told us during our committee hearings. Gabby Giffords was shot in the head during the massacre in Tucson in 2011. Six people died that day. The youngest among them was Christina-Taylor Green, the 9-year-old girl who loved to dance and who very well may have followed in Gabby's footsteps.

Christina-Taylor had just been elected to the student council at her elementary school and she had taken an interest in public service at a young age. That is why she was visiting her Congresswoman. Christina-Taylor was killed with the 13th bullet fired that day. Christina-Taylor Green is not with us anymore, but by some miracle Gabby is, and Gabby has used this second lease on life to be a voice for people such as Christina. Gabby mustered every bit of energy she could to appear before the Judiciary Committee in January. Let's not forget what she said, which was this:

Speaking is difficult, but I must say something important. Violence is a big problem. Too many children are dying. Too. Many. Children. We must do something. It will be hard. But the time is now. You. Must. Act. Be bold. Be courageous. Americans are counting on you.

Miya and Sam Rahamin asked us to take action too. They lost their father Reuven when a gunman opened fire at a sign factory in Minneapolis in Sep-

tember. Reuven is an immigrant from Israel and lived the American dream. He started a company that employed dozens of people over the years and exported products to the rest of the world, even to China—something Reuven was always eager to tell people. And Reuven was especially proud of his patented method for making Braille signs which, obviously, helped the blind. That was Reuven's thing—helping people. He was active in my synagogue and in his community, and he will always be remembered for his generous spirit.

Miya and Sam gave me a letter in January just a few weeks after Sandy Hook and a few months after the mass shooting that took their father's life, and others. This is what the letter said:

While Congress cannot prevent every death from gun violence, it has a moral obligation to attempt to save as many lives as possible. By passing this legislation, Congress can prevent some Americans from receiving the call that is dreaded most—that their father or mother, brother or sister, spouse or child will not be coming home. . . . I want my story told so that other families will not have to go through the devastation that mine has been through.

And then there is Neil Heslin. He came to Washington to testify at a Judiciary Committee hearing a few weeks ago. Neil told us about the morning of the shooting at Sandy Hook when his son Jesse was killed. On the way to school that morning, Neil and Jesse stopped at the deli to get breakfast. Neil got coffee. Jesse got what he called coffee, which was really hot chocolate. That is the part of the story that has really stayed with me. It is a small detail but it is a pure detail. It says something about how an innocent child looks up to his dad.

Neil was in a good mood. Christmas was around the corner and he had plans to make gingerbread houses with Jesse and Jesse's classmates that afternoon. Talking to Neil, you kind of got the sense that he was just as excited about this as the kids were—maybe more so. He really cherished this time together.

After they had their “coffees,” Neil dropped Jesse off at school. It was 9:04 a.m. Neil told us this:

Jesse gave me a hug and a kiss. And he said, “Goodbye, I love you.” Then he stopped, and he said, “I love mom, too.” That was the last I saw of Jesse.

Neil is not a political guy. In fact, he told us:

Half the time, I think it doesn't matter which group of you guys runs things out there, no offense.

But he continued:

Let me tell you, when you're sitting at a firehouse and it's one in the morning and you're hoping against hope that your son is still hiding somewhere in that school, you want any change that makes it one bit more likely that you'll see your boy again.

For me, that is what this is about, to make any change that will make it one bit more likely that the next Jesse will live to make gingerbread houses at Christmas. To see so many innocent lives lost on that December morning,

so many hopes and dreams dashed, so many families grieving, the country was heartbroken, my wife and I were heartbroken, and we are still. I wish we could offer more than our thoughts and our prayers and the thoughts and prayers of our fellow Minnesotans.

We cannot turn back time. We cannot bring back the lives we have lost. But if there is something we can do today in this Chamber—this week in this Chamber—to save lives in our communities tomorrow, to make it more likely that boy will be coming out of the school, then I think we should do it.

Thank you.

I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate only be extended until 8:30 p.m. and that at 8:30 p.m. the majority leader be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Manchin-Toomey amendment No. 715 to be set aside and the following amendments be in order to be called up: Grassley substitute amendment consistent with the summary, which is at the desk; Leahy-Collins amendment No. 713, trafficking; Cornyn amendment No. 719, conceal carry; Feinstein amendment No. 711, assault weapons-clip bans; Burr amendment No. 720, veterans-guns; Lautenberg-Blumenthal amendment No. 714, high-capacity clip ban; Barrasso amendment No. 717, privacy; and Harkin-Alexander amendment relative to mental health, the text of which is at the desk; that following leader remarks on Wednesday, April 17, the time until 4 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees to debate the amendments concurrently; that at 4 p.m., the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Manchin amendment No. 715; that upon disposition of the Manchin amendment, the Senate proceed to votes in relation to the remaining pending amendments in the order listed; that all amendments be subject to a 60-affirmative vote threshold; that no other amendments or motions to commit be in order to any of these amendments or the bill prior to the votes; that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote, and all after the first vote be 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we now proceed to a period of morning business, and Senators be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING DARN TOUGH VERMONT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Vermont is known for many of its great businesses and products. Among those successful companies is Darn Tough Vermont, whose brand represents the commitment to quality and excellence that defines Vermont. For nearly a decade, Darn Tough Vermont has been making the type of quality products our Nation has grown to expect from Vermonters.

Darn Tough was launched in 2004 by Ric Cabot, whose family founded Darn Tough's parent company in Vermont 35 years ago. For three generations, the Cabot family has stayed true to their roots and committed to the Northfield community. While other clothing manufacturers have outsourced their labor, the Cabots carry on where they began—manufacturing in New England, keeping faith with their customers and their 120 employees.

Darn Tough has a local feel to those who visit its factory and know its operators, but the company's name brand is known across the country and around the world wherever people appreciate a high-quality wool hiking and athletic sock, and its products are even worn overseas by our troops in combat. And as with other Vermont companies that equip and outfit our military, taxpayers can rest assured our troops are in good hands when their feet are in quality goods made by Darn Tough.

The Burlington Free Press recently paid tribute to Ric Cabot and all of the employees at Darn Tough for their hard work that continues to benefit our troops and the Vermont economy. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the recent Free Press article entitled "Rebuilding American textiles, one sock at a time: Darn Tough measures success," be printed into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From Burlington Free Press, Apr. 4, 2012]
REBUILDING AMERICAN TEXTILES, ONE SOCK
AT A TIME: DARN TOUGH MEASURES SUCCESS
(By Dan D'Ambrosio)

In Northfield, about 50 miles north of White River Junction where Ibex makes its home, Cabot Hosiery Mills, Inc. has been

making private label socks not only in America, but in Vermont, since 1978. Third generation owner Ric Cabot, who launched the company's own label—Darn Tough Vermont—in 2004, says one of the secrets to Darn Tough's success is the deceptive difficulty of making a good sock.

"People think socks are easy to do, it's just a pair of socks, how hard could it be?" Cabot said. "I guess that allows people to come into the market, but the staying power of companies that don't produce their own product is very short. There are so many people that are doing it well, it's hard to maintain a presence."

Perhaps the best symbol of Cabot's fastidiousness when it comes to socks is the 18-inch ruler projecting incongruously out of his back pocket when he greets visitors at the front door of the plain metal building that houses Darn Tough.

Cabot sat on the ruler and broke it about 20 years ago. He had one of Cabot's maintenance workers glue it back together, giving it the look of a broken bone that has healed well. There are certain things, Cabot says, you don't want to replace.

Cabot is never without his ruler as he roams the knitting floor and quality control departments of Darn Tough, handling socks, and measuring them.

"I sweat quarter-inches," Cabot says. "The first thing I do when I pick up a sock, is it the right length? If a sock is the right length, that means a lot of people are doing their jobs."

Later, at a quality audit station, Cabot picks up a sock, a men's large.

"Socks that made it this far, there's not going to be a huge hole, or wrong color, but the sizing should be right," he says. "This should be at or on 10¾ inches."

It's dead on. Socks, Cabot explains, are a math problem, "like most things in life." Among the numbers you have to work out are the size and gauge of the needles used to knit the socks. The gauge of the needle is basically how many needles you can fit in a circumference, because socks are knit in a circle.

"Those needles are in a cylinder," Cabot says. "You have to take into account needle size, cylinder size, what's the right weight of wool, nylon and Lycra? How are you going to reinforce it? How many stitches per inch? Where are you going to put the terry, the cushioning?"

Once you answer all of these many mathematical questions, Cabot says, you have the "DNA" of a Darn Tough sock. Then that DNA has to be expanded to hiking socks, running socks, cycling socks. Every sock has more in common, mathematically, than they don't have in common with other Darn Tough socks.

"That's the math of it, the durability story, the comfort story, the fit story," Cabot said.

But all those stories, he said, are trumped by another story when it comes to marketing Darn Tough socks: The Vermont story. Darn Tough employs about 120 people in Northfield, maintaining the New England tradition of textiles that once included hundreds of towns.

"You got to remind people, they know it, but you tell them nobody ever outsourced anything for quality," Cabot said. "That's the key."

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO RAMBLERS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last Monday, college basketball fans crowned their newest champion, the Louisville Cardinals. I wish to take a

moment to congratulate another historic college hoops team.

The NCAA recently announced that the 1963 NCAA Men's Basketball Champions, the Loyola University Chicago Ramblers, would become the first team ever enshrined into the National Collegiate Basketball Hall of Fame.

In an era when racism gripped the game, Loyola Coach George Ireland assembled the first predominately black team to win an NCAA Championship. Loyola's starting lineup featured four African Americans. This was unheard of in those days.

Despite hateful comments from the public and threatening letters from the Ku Klux Klan, Loyola lost only two games all season and marched through the Final Four. In the championship game they faced Cincinnati, a team which had been ranked No. 1 all season and had won the tournament the 2 previous years. If this wasn't pressure enough, the 1963 NCAA championship was also the first nationally televised NCAA title game.

Les Hunter, starting center for Loyola, remembered it as an opportunity to show "that the brand of black basketball was exciting and it provided for more exposure and recruiting for future players."

The championship game was an uphill battle for Loyola. After missing 13 of its first 14 shots, they trailed by 15 points with less than 15 minutes to play. Then, with only 9 seconds left and the score tied, Walter Vic Rouse tipped in a missed shot to put the Loyola Ramblers ahead by 2 points. When the final buzzer sounded, the Loyola University Chicago Ramblers were national champions.

To this day, Loyola remains the only school from Illinois to have won the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Championship.

To most players, winning the NCAA championship would be unquestionably the highlight of the season.

As Ramblers point guard and All-American Jerry Harkness says, now that he has gotten older he is even more proud of a game Loyola played earlier in that championship season.

On March 15, 1963, Loyola and Mississippi State played a game the NCAA calls The Game of Change. It was a game which changed college basketball forever—and helped change race relations in America.

Mississippi State had won their conference for the past 3 years, but it appeared they would be unable to compete in the 1963 NCAA tournament because of an unwritten State law barring the team from competing against teams with black players. Rather than forfeit their place, Mississippi State's president and coach decided to defy Governor Ross Barnett's vow of "segregation now and forever." They snuck their team out of town under the cover of darkness to avoid being served an injunction barring them from leaving the State.

Loyola won The Game of Change, but both teams, together, made history.

The Game of Change altered college basketball and became a watershed event in the civil rights era. Three years later, for the first time in NCAA history, Texas Western, with an all-black starting lineup, won the championship. The 1963 Loyola University Chicago Ramblers helped make this possible.

Loyola's basketball team was led by Coach Ireland and Assistant Coach Jerry Lyne, and featured starters John Egan, Jerry Harkness, Les Hunter, Ron Miller, and Vic Rouse, as well as reserves Dan Connaughton, Jim Reardon, Rich Rochelle, and Chuck Wood. All of those individuals are members of the Loyola Athletics Hall of Fame, and each of the five starters has also had his jersey number retired.

I congratulate the 1963 Loyola University Chicago Ramblers on their accomplishments and look forward to their induction ceremony in the National Collegiate Basketball Hall of Fame on November 24, 2013.

HONORING MILDRED MANNING

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today I honor the legacy of Mildred Manning, the last surviving American female WWII POW, who died March 8 at age 98. Mrs. Manning's heroics in Bataan and Corregidor are an enduring example of the bravery of American servicemembers and of nurses' dedication to caring for patients. I wish to share her amazing story.

Mrs. Manning, born in 1914 on a poor Georgia farm, aspired to escape the poverty which surrounded her. She attended nursing school during the Depression, and in 1939 she joined the Army Nurse Corps. Wishing to see the world, she requested assignment in the Philippines.

Weeks after Mrs. Manning arrived in Manila, Japanese forces attacked Pearl Harbor in Hawaii and a U.S. air base near Manila. During the months-long Battle of the Philippines which forced an American retreat to the peninsula of Bataan and the island of Corregidor, Mrs. Manning was one of a handful of Army and Navy nurses who braved the relentless attacks to treat wounded and dying soldiers. When Americans surrendered in May, 1942, Mrs. Manning was one of 77 Army and Navy nurses who were captured and spent the rest of the war in harrowing imprisonment.

The prison, built on the grounds of Manila's Santo Tomas University, held nearly 4,000 people in squalid conditions. There were no showers, beds, or kitchens. Hundreds of people were forced to share a single toilet. Food was so scarce prisoners suffered severely from malnutrition.

Despite these trials, Lieutenant Manning and her fellow nurses remained fiercely dedicated to providing medical care to those around them. For 2½ years, they maintained strict order, wore uniforms, and cared for their fellow prisoners. For their efforts, she and her fellow nurses earned the moniker,

"Angels of the Pacific." Upon their return to the U.S. in 1945, Mrs. Manning and her fellow nurses were honored by President Roosevelt with the Bronze Star Medal and a Presidential Unit Citation.

We are all so grateful for Mildred Manning's service. Her legacy will live on in our Nation's history, reminding us of the horrors of war and of the bravery of the special people who persevere by helping others. Mrs. Manning's unwavering dedication to serving our Nation in the midst of hardship continues to inspire me, and I am honored to commemorate her today.

ISRAEL'S 65TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I wish to express my congratulations to Israel on the 65th anniversary of its independence.

Today, America's closest ally in the Middle East, Israel, commemorates its Independence Day, Yom Ha'atzmaut—one day after its Memorial Day, Yom Hazikaron, and one week after Holocaust Remembrance Day, Yom HaShoah.

While Independence Day is a celebration for the people of Israel, this Memorial Day was marked by somber ceremonies and national grief over the loss of their soldiers. Nationwide sirens and moments of silence emphasize the sacrifices Israelis have made to protect their thriving, free and democratic state. These intensely personal losses in such a small country underscore the continuing threats faced by Israelis, the scale of their efforts and the importance of a Jewish homeland. And Yom HaShoah reminds Israelis of the terrible devastation of the Holocaust that happened to the Jewish people in a time before they could celebrate the existence of the modern State of Israel.

As we celebrate Israel's Independence Day, we must continue to reduce the key threats to Israel's security. We must focus on opportunities for peace in the Middle East. Israel has always been prepared to pursue those opportunities and make peace with its neighbors. Over the past six decades, despite diplomatic gestures, multiple Arab countries have repeatedly attacked Israel. We should not forget that it was Palestinian, not Israeli, leaders who walked away from the negotiation table at Camp David in 2000, on the eve of what would have been a historic breakthrough for peace.

Today, it is Israel who continues to acknowledge the necessary framework for any peace agreement—a two state solution. While Israel has shown willingness for direct negotiations, the Palestinians continue to be an unreliable partner in moving toward peace. It is vitally important to stress the importance of the Palestinian Authority's close security cooperation with Israel. If peace is to be possible, the Palestinian Authority also needs to confront the recent surge in violence in the

West Bank, cease all anti-Israel incitement and renounce Hamas until it unequivocally meets the three Quartet requirements.

I am proud to have joined with 78 of my colleagues in reminding President Obama in a letter on the eve of his visit to Israel that the U.S. and Israel share common values and interests, and that Israel stands ready for peace. Top among these interests is restarting the peace process and preventing Iran from becoming a nuclear state.

This is precisely why the role of the United States in this process must be one of an honest broker. President Obama must make clear that the pathway for peace is through unconditional direct negotiations between both the Israelis and Palestinians and that the United States vigorously opposes any Palestinian efforts to circumvent direct negotiations. I commend President Obama for pursuing peace during his recent trip to the Middle East, and for working on policy solutions to address the urgent and important threats facing Israel and the United States today.

Since Israel's founding 65 years ago, every American administration has worked to strengthen the bonds between our two nations. This support has been vital for Israel, as the nation is under the constant threat of military and terrorist attacks, economic boycotts and diplomatic hostility—often merely due to the fact of its very existence. At this critical moment, when Iran is moving forward with its nuclear program and simultaneously strengthening Hezbollah's capacity to attack Israel, it is imperative that the Obama administration say in clear and unambiguous language that we stand with the people of Israel and will do all in our power to protect our shared values and national bonds.

As Israel celebrates its 65th anniversary, let us all proclaim that the U.S. continues to value its unbreakable alliance with our closest ally in the Middle East.

NATIONAL HEALTHCARE DECISIONS DAY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to recognize that today, April 16, 2013, is National Healthcare Decisions Day.

National Healthcare Decisions Day exists to inspire, educate and empower the public and providers about the importance of advance care planning. It began as a local, grassroots effort 7 years ago in the Commonwealth of Virginia, started by a Virginia Attorney, and it became an annual event in 2008.

It now is recognized across all 50 States as an annual initiative to provide clear, concise and consistent information on health care decision making to the public and providers. This year over 100 national organizations, including groups like the AARP, Volunteers of America, government groups like the Veterans Health Administration, providers like the hospital company HCA, American College of Nurs-

ing, and American Academy of Nursing, along with faith-based groups like B'nai B'rith International have all pledged to participate today to spread the word on the value of conversations about our goals and values and preferences about medical treatment.

I know how important this is, not just from my time serving both as a Governor and as a Senator, but also through the eyes of a loved one who struggled with these issues. My mother suffered from Alzheimer's disease for 10 years, and for 9 of those years, she could not speak. My father, sister and I found grappling with the challenges of caring for her difficult. The difficulty was greater because, when she was first diagnosed, my family did not take the opportunity to talk in a frank and fully informed way with her and her health care providers about the full array of health care options available or about what her priorities would be during the final years of her life.

It is so frustrating that some have labeled advance care planning as efforts to take away choice from patients. This is ignorant and is disrespectful to those struggling with illness and caregiving. In fact, what we are trying to do is the opposite, give patients and their families the ability to make decisions when they can and provide enough support and information so that they can make informed choices based upon their own values and goals.

It is not easy, this is a subject that most people do their best to avoid: who will decide how we will live when we are unable to make our own decisions. But it is critical.

Most of us, more than 80 percent, will be unable to make decisions about what medical treatments we will receive for some period in our lives. The lucky will regain decision-making ability, but most of us will lose it for good.

Family or friends are then asked to step in. Sometimes they are asked to make routine decisions, like using antibiotics to treat an infection. Sometimes it is more significant. Would a hip replacement improve quality of life when you are physically pretty healthy, but substantially impaired by Alzheimer's or another dementia? Or would it cause more harm than good?

Often proxies are forced to choose between terrible options. Should they consent to an amputation of a gangrenous leg of a loved one who can no longer get out of bed, communicate, or recognize family for the remote chance that doing so will slow, but not cure, the progression of vascular disease?

State laws and Supreme Court decisions direct proxies to make the decision that a now-incapacitated loved one would have made.

But research says this often does not work. It might not work, for example, because a widow never told her adult children what she would want.

Maybe she assumed that her children knew.

Maybe she feared that they would disagree with her preferences.

Whatever the reason, those who make decisions for her do so blind-folded with their hands tied behind their backs.

Too often, proxies are left with guilt, anxiety, and depression.

But some are at peace because they know what the person wants. They know because they talk about how decisions should be made and who should make them. They talk about when a decision best honors the person by pulling back on treatments designed to treat the disease and instead forge ahead with aggressive symptom control. They talk about when a hospital bed at home is the right choice over tubes and needles and monitors in the ICU, or vice versa.

After talking, they write it down in an advance directive.

Each of us has an obligation to our families and friends to think about what we want, to talk to them about what we want, and to document our choices.

In the last two sessions of Congress, I have introduced a bill to help patients, providers, and caregivers get the support and education they need. Among other things, it will make advance directives more accessible, and it will make it easier for providers to follow them. I am planning on introducing a bill, the Senior Navigation and Planning Act, in the coming weeks.

However, today, I urge you all, on this National Decisions Day, to discuss your preferences and goals with your family and friends. Fill out an advance directive. Think of it as a gift.

NATIONAL HEALTHCARE DECISIONS DAY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss a very important issue—living well at the end of life.

Today is National Healthcare Decisions Day. It is a day dedicated to reminding people to plan for the future, to encourage discussions—no matter how difficult—to let families, friends, and caregivers know your wishes, whatever they may be.

This is an incredibly important and pressing issue, but it is one that no one likes to talk about. No one likes to face their own mortality. But we must because we know that more often than not, patients' preferences are not known or adhered to near the end of life.

In the absence of clearly defined expectations and wishes, death can be an incredibly scary and confusing time for a patient and their family. Misunderstanding among physicians and family members about a loved one's final wishes can cause significant psychological and emotional hardship. Families may disagree about treatment options and argue about whether their loved one should get more or less treatment, aggressive intervention or palliative care.

These disagreements can often result in the patient receiving a different course of treatment than they might have preferred—an undesirable yet easily avoidable outcome. We need to empower patients to express their wishes, to exert their choice, and to clearly define their preferences and expectations, whatever they may be, to those who will be along their side at that difficult time.

People often think, “I’m too young to worry about that.” Or, “I have plenty of time to deal with that later.” But these conversations aren’t just important for people who have been diagnosed with terminal illness or individuals approaching old age. In fact, if you wait too long, you may not get the chance.

Most diseases don’t discriminate and accidents can happen to anyone. The time for us to think about what our wishes might be is before we are in a crisis—when we can think clearly about the consequences of the course we select, consult with our spiritual and moral leaders, and discuss these difficult issues with family and friends. There are many physical, emotional, and spiritual components to these issues, and it takes careful reflection to determine which are most important to you.

I am very proud to say that my State has been a leader on this issue. We have a great organization called Honoring Choices Minnesota that provides resources and tools to help people start these difficult conversations with their families.

There will be several events in my State today and all across the country highlighting the importance of not only making your preferences known, but ensuring that people who want to can document their wishes through an advanced care directive, physicians order for life sustaining treatment, or other legal mechanism.

I encourage my colleagues and all Americans to take time today to think about their families, their wishes, and to begin planning for the future.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL DELANEY

● Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and congratulate an excellent lawyer and a dedicated public servant—New Hampshire Attorney General Michael Delaney. As Mike completes more than 14 years of service to the people of New Hampshire I would like to acknowledge his significant record of accomplishments.

Long before Mike rose to the position of attorney general, he served as a prosecutor in the homicide unit. I was privileged to work with him on several murder trials, including the case involving two murdered Dartmouth professors. And I was proud to continue serving with him when I was the attorney general and he was the deputy at-

torney general, working together to provide leadership for the office.

Having had the privilege of working side by side with Mike, I can attest to his passion for seeking justice in all prosecutions, his outstanding advocacy on behalf of victims, and his commitment to providing the State with legal representation and counsel of the highest quality.

After serving as legal counsel to the governor, Mike was appointed to serve as New Hampshire’s attorney general in 2009. Throughout his service as attorney general, Mike served the people of New Hampshire with diligence, independence and integrity, leading by example as he and his staff performed the constitutional, statutory and common law duties of the attorney general as the State’s chief legal officer and chief law enforcement officer.

As Mike leaves public service to return to private practice, I commend him on a job well done. He has successfully carried forward the highest traditions of excellence and independence of the office of attorney general and leaves a legacy of improvements to all aspects of the work of the New Hampshire Department of Justice. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking him for his service and wishing him, his wife Caroline, and their children Will, Maggie and Katie, well in all their future endeavors.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:39 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 882. An act to prohibit the awarding of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has no seriously delinquent tax debts, and for other Purposes.

H.R. 1162. An act to amend title 31, United States Code, to make improvements in the Government Accountability Office.

H.R. 1246. An act to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to provide that the District of Columbia Treasurer or one of the Deputy Chief Financial Officers of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia may perform the functions and duties of the Office in an acting capacity if there is a vacancy in the Office.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 882. An act to prohibit the awarding of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has no seriously delinquent tax debts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1162. An act to amend title 31, United States Code, to make improvements in the

Government Accountability Office; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 729. A bill to protect law abiding citizens by preventing criminals from obtaining firearms.

S. 730. A bill to prevent criminals from obtaining firearms through straw purchasing and trafficking.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 743. A bill to restore States’ sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1131. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program” (RIN0560-A106) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1132. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Accounting and Reporting Requirements; Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Funding and Fiscal Affairs; GAAP References and Other Conforming Amendments” (RIN3052-AC75) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1133. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a date for the completion of an annual report relative to recruitment incentives; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1134. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Report to Congress on Corrosion Policy and Oversight Budget Materials for Fiscal Year 2014”; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1135. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Report to Congress On Repair of Naval Vessels in Foreign Shipyards”; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1136. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Security Education Program for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1137. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Syria that was declared in Executive Order

13338 of May 11, 2004; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1138. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Mongolia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1139. A communication from the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Hong Kong; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1140. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1141. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1142. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Identity Theft Red Flags" (RIN3038-AD99) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1143. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports on sequestration entitled: "OMB Sequestration Preview Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2014" and "OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committees on the Budget; and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1144. A communication from the Acting Assistant Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska—2013-14 and 2014-15 Subsistence Taking of Fish Regulations" (RIN1018-AX64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1145. A communication from the Director of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, (8) eight reports relative to vacancies in the Environmental Protection Agency, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1146. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Branch of Recovery, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reinstatement of Removal of the Virginia Northern Flying Squirrel From the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife" (RIN1018-AZ31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1147. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Foreign Species, Fish and

Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Technical Correction for African Wild Ass" (RIN1018-AY31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1148. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revised Designation of Critical Habitat for *Allium munzii* (Munz's Onion) and *Atriplex coronata* var. *notatior* (San Jacinto Valley Crowscale)" (RIN1018-AX42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1149. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Southwestern Willow Flycatcher" (RIN1018-AX43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1150. A communication from the Human Resources Specialist, Office of the Executive Director, Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the No FEAR Act for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1151. A communication from the President, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Foundation's fiscal year 2012 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1152. A communication from the Director, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's fiscal year 2012 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1153. A communication from the Staff Director, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2012 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Jacob J. Lew, of New York, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund for a term of five years; United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of five years; United States Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of five years; United States Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination list which was printed in the RECORD on the date indi-

cated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that this nomination lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Margaret A. Hanson-Muse and ending with Sarah E. Kemp, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 27, 2013.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 731. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency to conduct an empirical impact study on proposed rules relating to the International Basel III agreement on general risk-based capital requirements, as they apply to community banks; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 732. A bill to modify the criteria used by the Corps of Engineers to dredge small ports; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. COONS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 733. A bill to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 734. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 735. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and assistance provided to surviving spouses of veterans under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 736. A bill to establish a maximum amount for special use permit fees applicable to certain cabins on National Forest System land in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S. 737. A bill to require the Federal banking agencies to conduct a quantitative impact study on the cumulative effect of the Basel III framework devised by the Basel

Committee on Banking Supervision before issuing final rules amending the agencies' general risk-based capital requirements for determining risk-weighted assets, as proposed in the Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rules Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, the Standardized Approach for Risk-Weighted Assets Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, and the Implementation of Basel III, Minimum Regulatory Capital Ratios Notice of Proposed Rulemaking issued in June 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 738. A bill to grant the Secretary of the Interior permanent authority to authorize States to issue electronic duck stamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 739. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish direct care registered nurse-to-patient staffing ratio requirements in hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 740. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require drug manufacturers to provide drug rebates for drugs dispensed to low-income individuals under the Medicare prescription drug benefit program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 741. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. THUNE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 742. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 743. A bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 744. A bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. VITTER):

S. Res. 98. A resolution honoring the life, legacy, and example of British Prime Minister Baroness Margaret Thatcher; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. COONS, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. Res. 99. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the United States during Public Service Recognition Week; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. Res. 100. A resolution commending and congratulating the University of Louisville men's basketball team for winning its third Division I National Collegiate Athletic Association championship, and the University of Louisville women's basketball team for being runner up in the 2013 Women's Division I National Collegiate Athletic Association Basketball Tournament; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 22

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 22, a bill to establish background check procedures for gun shows.

S. 33

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 33, a bill to prohibit the transfer or possession of large capacity ammunition feeding devices, and for other purposes.

S. 34

At the request of Ms. WARREN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 34, a bill to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of firearms or the issuance of firearms and explosives licenses to known or suspected dangerous terrorists.

S. 150

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 150, a bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes.

S. 162

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 162, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004.

S. 264

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 264, a bill to expand access to community mental health centers and improve the quality of mental health care for all Americans.

S. 306

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 306, a bill to authorize all Bureau of

Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 382

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 382, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 395

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 395, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide further protection for puppies.

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 463

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 463, a bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to modify the definition of the term "biobased product".

S. 475

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 475, a bill to reauthorize the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, to provide assistance to Best Buddies to support the expansion and development of mentoring programs, and for other purposes.

S. 526

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 526, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 572

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 572, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the conditions under which certain persons may be treated as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes.

S. 612

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 612, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to remove social security account numbers from Medicare identification cards and communications provided to Medicare beneficiaries in order to protect Medicare beneficiaries from identity theft.

S. 629

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 646

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 646, a bill to create the National Endowment for the Oceans to promote the protection and conservation of United States ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes ecosystems, and for other purposes.

S. 675

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 675, a bill to prohibit contracting with the enemy.

S. 679

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 679, a bill to promote local and regional farm and food systems, and for other purposes.

S. 680

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 680, a bill to rescind amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2013 for the Department of Defense for the Medium Extended Air Defense System, and for other purposes.

S. 687

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNES) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 687, a bill to prohibit the closing of air traffic control towers, and for other purposes.

S. 691

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, her name was added as a cosponsor of S.

691, a bill to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices.

At the request of Mr. CARPER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 691, supra.

At the request of Ms. WARREN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 691, supra.

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 691, supra.

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 691, supra.

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 691, supra.

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 691, supra.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 691, supra.

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 691, supra.

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 691, supra.

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 691, supra.

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 691, supra.

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 691, supra.

At the request of Mr. REED, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 691, supra.

S. 700

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 700, a bill to ensure that the education and training provided members of the Armed Forces and veterans better assists members and veterans in obtaining civilian certifications and licenses, and for other purposes.

S. 703

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 703, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the eligibility of the Hong Kong Special Administration Region for designation for participation in the visa waiver program for certain visitors to the United States.

S. 707

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 707, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans.

S. 719

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 719, a bill to provide for

the expansion of Federal efforts concerning the prevention, education, treatment, and research activities related to Lyme and other tick-borne diseases, including the establishment of a Tick-Borne Diseases Advisory Committee.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 720, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for taxpayers making donations with their returns of income tax to the Federal Government to pay down the public debt.

S. 730

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 730, a bill to prevent criminals from obtaining firearms through straw purchasing and trafficking.

S. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 6, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 65

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 65, a resolution strongly supporting the full implementation of United States and international sanctions on Iran and urging the President to continue to strengthen enforcement of sanctions legislation.

S. RES. 97

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 97, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Food and Drug Administration should encourage the use of abuse-deterrent formulations of drugs.

AMENDMENT NO. 711

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 711 intended to be proposed to S. 649, a bill to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 714

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 714 intended to be proposed to S. 649, a bill to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. REED, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 714 intended to be proposed to S. 649, *supra*.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 735. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and assistance provided to surviving spouses of veterans under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, as the Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, one of my top priorities is to honor the promise that we made, as a nation, to care for veterans and their survivors. The Senate recently passed a resolution, which I was proud to cosponsor, designating April 5 as "Gold Star Wives Day," in honor of the Gold Star Wives of America, a nonprofit organization that provides services, support, and representation for widows and widowers whose spouses died on active duty in the military or as a result of a service-connected disability. We recently celebrated "Gold Star Wives Day," by recognizing the sacrifices of the families of fallen servicemembers and veterans.

In addition to honoring surviving spouses and families, we must take steps forward to provide the comprehensive care and benefits they need. Without a doubt, a decade of war has had a major impact on our military families. Over 6,600 U.S. servicemembers have died in Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. They leave behind spouses, who must now face a variety of issues such as financial difficulties, preserving the family home, maintaining the family business, and caring for their children.

Earlier this year, the Veterans' Affairs Committee heard from the Gold Star Wives of America about the significant challenges that survivors continue to face. Among the issues the organization advocated for were improved Dependency and Indemnity Compensation benefits and qualification requirements. These are some of the challenges that this legislation would address.

This legislation would improve existing survivor benefits and establish a new pilot program to help address the grief counseling needs of surviving spouses. It would also expand health care and other supportive services to children who suffer from spina bifida as a result of their parent's exposure to certain herbicide agents during service in Thailand during the Vietnam War. This legislation would make a real and positive impact in the lives of the approximately 350,000 surviving spouses and children, currently receiving benefits, who have lost a loved one as a result of service to this country.

The Survivor Benefits Improvement Act of 2013 would extend the timeframe

for increased DIC benefits for surviving spouses with children from 2 years to 5 years. A 2001 evaluation of benefits for survivors of veterans with service-connected disabilities revealed that survivors with dependents perceived an approximate \$6,000 annual gap between DIC received and DIC needed. The study also found that the average total household income decreased over \$20,000 on average during the transition period after the veteran's death. As a result of this study, it was recommended that the \$250 monthly increase in DIC payment be extended from two years to five years for surviving spouses with dependent children. It has now been over a decade since the 2001 report and we still have not provided this increase.

Furthermore, a recent survey from the Department of Veterans Affairs indicated that approximately 44 percent of surviving spouse respondents had incomes below \$20,000. It is clear that this legislation is necessary to provide much needed additional support to survivors during the period following a veteran's death, especially for low-income families. We must act to remedy this shortfall immediately.

This legislation would also expand eligibility for DIC to surviving spouses who remarry at or after age 55. The lower remarriage age would ensure that surviving spouses receive benefits at a requirement level comparable to other federal survivor programs. For example, under the Military Survivor Benefit Plan and for federal employees generally, the remarriage age is 55 for retaining benefits.

At present, VA presumes that spina bifida in biological children of certain Vietnam-era and certain Korea service veterans was caused by the veterans' exposure to Agent Orange during military service. As a result, VA provides health care, vocational rehabilitation and employment services, and a monthly monetary allowance to qualifying children. Although Agent Orange was primarily used in Vietnam, it was also used at military installations and other facilities, such as those in Korea and Thailand. Veterans who served in certain occupations at certain bases in Thailand are eligible to receive service-connected disability compensation. Therefore, it is only logical that VA should also be required to provide benefits to the children of veterans with qualifying service in Thailand, who are suffering from spina bifida.

The loss of a loved one is a devastating and life changing event. This legislation would strengthen our dedication to the overall well-being of surviving spouses by providing a pilot program on grief counseling in retreat settings. The program would enable surviving spouses, and dependents in certain instances, to receive the counseling, support, and sense of community necessary to heal from losing a loved one.

We have made a steadfast and unwavering commitment not only to our vet-

erans, but to their surviving spouses and children. This legislation would strengthen, develop, and expand essential programs and benefits for survivors. Veterans and their families, who have both sacrificed so much for this country, deserve these benefits. We must deliver.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 735

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Survivor Benefits Improvement Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF INITIAL PERIOD FOR INCREASED DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES WITH CHILDREN.

Section 1311(f)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking "two-year" and inserting "five-year".

SEC. 3. ELIGIBILITY FOR DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION, HEALTH CARE, AND HOUSING LOANS FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES WHO REMARRY AFTER AGE 55.

Subparagraph (B) of section 103(d)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(B) The remarriage after age 55 of the surviving spouse of a veteran shall not bar the furnishing of benefits specified in paragraph (5) to such person as the surviving spouse of the veteran."

SEC. 4. BENEFITS FOR CHILDREN OF CERTAIN THAILAND SERVICE VETERANS BORN WITH SPINA BIFIDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 18 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 1822. Benefits for children of certain Thailand service veterans born with spina bifida

"(a) BENEFITS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may provide to any child of a veteran of covered service in Thailand who is suffering from spina bifida the health care, vocational training and rehabilitation, and monetary allowance required to be paid to a child of a Vietnam veteran who is suffering from spina bifida under subchapter I of this chapter as if such child of a veteran of covered service in Thailand were a child of a Vietnam veteran who is suffering from spina bifida under such subchapter.

"(b) SPINA BIFIDA CONDITIONS COVERED.—This section applies with respect to all forms and manifestations of spina bifida, except spina bifida occulta.

"(c) VETERAN OF COVERED SERVICE IN THAILAND.—For purposes of this section, a veteran of covered service in Thailand is any individual, without regard to the characterization of that individual's service, who—

"(1) served in the active military, naval, or air service in Thailand, as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and ending on May 7, 1975; and

"(2) is determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to have been exposed to a herbicide agent during such service in Thailand.

"(d) HERBICIDE AGENT.—For purposes of this section, the term 'herbicide agent' means a chemical in a herbicide used in support of United States and allied military operations in Thailand, as determined by the

Secretary in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and ending on May 7, 1975.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SUBCHAPTER HEADING.—The heading for subchapter III of chapter 18 of such title is amended by inserting “AND THAILAND” after “KOREA”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 18 of such title is amended—

(A) by striking the item relating to subchapter III and inserting the following new item:

“SUBCHAPTER III—CHILDREN OF CERTAIN KOREA AND THAILAND SERVICE VETERANS BORN WITH SPINA BIFIDA”; AND

(B) by inserting after the item relating to section 1821 the following new item:

“1822. Benefits for children of certain Thailand service veterans born with spina bifida.”.

SEC. 5. PILOT PROGRAM ON GRIEF COUNSELING IN RETREAT SETTINGS FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES OF VETERANS WHO DIE WHILE SERVING ON ACTIVE DUTY IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Commencing not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out, through the Readjustment Counseling Service of the Veterans Health Administration, a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of providing grief counseling services described in subsection (b) in group retreat settings to surviving spouses of veterans who die while serving on active duty in the Armed Forces.

(2) PARTICIPATION AT ELECTION OF SURVIVING SPOUSE.—The participation of a surviving spouse in the pilot program under this section shall be at the election of the surviving spouse.

(b) COVERED SERVICES.—The services provided to a surviving spouse under the pilot program shall include the following:

(1) Information and counseling on coping with grief.

(2) Information about benefits and services available to surviving spouses under laws administered by the Secretary.

(3) Such other information and counseling as the Secretary considers appropriate to assist a surviving spouse under the pilot program with adjusting to the death of a spouse.

(c) LOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program at not fewer than six locations as follows:

(1) Three locations at which surviving spouses with dependent children are encouraged to bring their children.

(2) Three locations at which surviving spouses with dependent children are not encouraged to bring their children.

(d) DURATION.—The pilot program shall be carried out during the two-year period beginning on the date of the commencement of the pilot program.

(e) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the completion of the first year of the pilot program and not later than 180 days after the completion of the pilot program, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the pilot program.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall contain the findings and conclusions of the Secretary as a result of the pilot program, and shall include such recommendations for the continuation or expansion of the pilot program as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “active duty”, “surviving spouse”, and “veteran” have the meanings given such terms in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 740. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require drug manufacturers to provide drug rebates for drugs dispensed to low-income individuals under the Medicare prescription drug benefit program; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Medicare Drug Savings Act of 2013. I am proud to be joined by my long-time partner in this effort, Senator BILL NELSON, as well as my colleagues Senator TAMMY BALDWIN of Wisconsin, Senator RICHARD BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut, Senator BARBARA BOXER of California, Senator SHERROD BROWN of Ohio, Senator RICHARD DURBIN of Illinois, Senator AL FRANKEN of Minnesota, Senator ANGUS KING of Maine, Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota, Senator PATRICK LEAHY of Vermont, Senator JEFF MERKLEY of Oregon, Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island, Senator BERNIE SANDERS of Vermont, Senator BRIAN SCHATZ of Hawaii, Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN of New Hampshire, Senator DEBBIE STABENOW of Michigan, Senator TOM UDALL of New Mexico and Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island, in introducing this important piece of legislation.

We need to responsibly reduce our deficit, but taking away health care for seniors and other vulnerable people should be off the table. Rather than dismantling Medicare and Medicaid, we can save billions of dollars by holding drug companies accountable and using the purchasing power of the federal government to negotiate lower drug prices, just the way any private insurance plan would use its purchasing power to lower prices.

That is why we are introducing the Medicare Drug Savings Act. The bill will eliminate a special deal from the 2003 Medicare prescription drug law that allows drug companies to charge Medicare higher prices for some seniors' prescription drugs. It would require prescription drug manufacturers to pay rebates to Medicare for dually eligible beneficiaries in Medicare and Medicaid as well as other low-income Medicare beneficiaries. This proposal would reduce the deficit, saving taxpayers an estimated \$141.2 billion over the next 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office. Similar proposals were also included in the recommendations from the President's Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, the President's framework for deficit reduction and the President's budget for fiscal year 2014.

Prior to the creation of the Medicare prescription drug program, brand-name

drug manufacturers paid a drug rebate for dually eligible beneficiaries in Medicare and Medicaid. However, when the new Medicare drug program was established, drug companies no longer had to provide these rebates, resulting in windfall profits for prescription drug manufacturers, at taxpayers' expense.

The Medicare Drug Savings Act would require prescription drug manufacturers to pay the difference between the lowest current rebates they are paying to private Part D drug plans, and the percentage of Average Manufacturer Price, AMP, they currently pay under Medicaid, plus an additional rebate if their prices grow faster than inflation. They would be required to participate in the rebate program in order for their drugs to be covered by Medicare Part D.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. In doing so, we will protect Medicare for seniors, and end a giveaway to drug companies that is costing taxpayers billions of dollars.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 98—HONORING THE LIFE, LEGACY, AND EXAMPLE OF BRITISH PRIME MINISTER BARONESS MARGARET THATCHER

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 98

Whereas Baroness Margaret Thatcher was born on October 13, 1925, in Grantham, United Kingdom;

Whereas Baroness Margaret Thatcher first visited the United States in 1967;

Whereas Baroness Margaret Thatcher became the first and, to date, only female Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in 1979;

Whereas Baroness Margaret Thatcher served as Prime Minister for 11 years, making her the longest-serving Prime Minister in the 20th century;

Whereas Baroness Margaret Thatcher in 1982 led United Kingdom efforts to liberate the Falkland Islands after they had been invaded and occupied by the Government of Argentina;

Whereas Baroness Margaret Thatcher in 1983 supported the deployment of United States nuclear cruise missiles at United Kingdom bases and the deployment by the United States of short-range nuclear missiles in Europe when there was stiff opposition to her doing so;

Whereas Baroness Margaret Thatcher in 1984 survived an assassination attempt by the Irish Republican Army in Brighton, United Kingdom, and declared that “all attempts to destroy democracy by terrorism will fail”;

Whereas Baroness Margaret Thatcher in 1986 allowed U.S. F-111s to fly from British territory to attack sites in Libya in response to the Berlin discotheque bombing which killed 2 members of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas Baroness Margaret Thatcher's personal relationship with President Ronald Reagan demonstrated once again that the special relationship between the United

States and the United Kingdom is a powerful force for good in the world;

Whereas Baroness Margaret Thatcher stood shoulder to shoulder with United States leaders against the Soviet Union and the threats posed by communism;

Whereas Baroness Margaret Thatcher defended United Kingdom sovereignty within the European Economic Community; and

Whereas Baroness Margaret Thatcher dedicated her life to the cause of democracy, freedom, and economic liberty for the United Kingdom and the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the legacy of Baroness Margaret Thatcher for her life-long commitment to advancing freedom, liberty, and democracy throughout the world;

(2) extends its deepest condolences and sympathy to the family of Baroness Margaret Thatcher and the people of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(3) recognizes that Baroness Margaret Thatcher, working with President Ronald Reagan, helped bring a peaceful end to the Cold War;

(4) reiterates its continued support for the close tie and the special relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom; and

(5) expresses admiration for Baroness Margaret Thatcher and her legacy as an inspirational and transformative leader in the United Kingdom and the world.

SENATE RESOLUTION 99—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT PUBLIC SERVANTS SHOULD BE COMMENDED FOR THEIR DEDICATION AND CONTINUED SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES DURING PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. COONS, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:.

S. RES. 99

Whereas the week of May 5 through 11, 2013 has been designated as “Public Service Recognition Week” to honor the employees of the Federal Government and State and local governments of the United States;

Whereas Public Service Recognition Week provides an opportunity to recognize and promote the important contributions of public servants and honor the diverse men and women who meet the needs of the United States through work at all levels of government;

Whereas millions of individuals work in government service in every city, county, and State across the United States and in hundreds of cities abroad;

Whereas public service is a noble calling involving a variety of challenging and rewarding professions;

Whereas the Federal Government and State and local governments are responsive, innovative, and effective because of the outstanding work of public servants;

Whereas the United States is a great and prosperous country, and public service employees contribute significantly to that greatness and prosperity;

Whereas the United States benefits daily from the knowledge and skills of the highly-trained individuals who work in public service;

Whereas public servants—

(1) defend the freedom of the people of the United States and advance the interests of the United States around the world;

(2) provide vital strategic support functions to the Armed Forces of the United States and serve in the National Guard and Reserves;

(3) fight crime and fires;

(4) ensure equal access to secure, efficient, and affordable mail service;

(5) deliver Social Security and Medicare benefits;

(6) fight disease and promote better health;

(7) protect the environment and the parks of the United States;

(8) enforce laws guaranteeing equal employment opportunity and healthy working conditions;

(9) defend and secure critical infrastructure;

(10) help the people of the United States recover from natural disasters and terrorist attacks;

(11) teach and work in schools and libraries;

(12) develop new technologies and explore the Earth, the Moon, and space to help improve understanding of how the world changes;

(13) improve and secure transportation systems;

(14) promote economic growth; and

(15) assist the veterans of the United States;

Whereas members of the uniformed services and civilian employees at all levels of government make significant contributions to the general welfare of the United States, and are on the front lines in the fight to defeat terrorism and maintain homeland security;

Whereas public servants work in a professional manner to build relationships with other countries and cultures in order to better represent the interests and promote the ideals of the United States;

Whereas public servants alert Congress and the public to government waste, fraud, and abuse, and of dangers to public health;

Whereas the men and women serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, as well as the skilled trade and craft Federal employees who provide support to their efforts, are committed to doing their jobs regardless of the circumstances, and contribute greatly to the security of the United States and the world;

Whereas public servants have bravely fought in armed conflict in defense of the United States and its ideals, and deserve the care and benefits they have earned through their honorable service;

Whereas government workers have much to offer, as demonstrated by their expertise and innovative ideas, and serve as examples by passing on institutional knowledge to train the next generation of public servants; and

Whereas the week of May 5 through 11, 2013 marks the 29th anniversary of Public Service Recognition Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of the week of May 5 through 11, 2013 as “Public Service Recognition Week”;

(2) commends public servants for their outstanding contributions to this great country during Public Service Recognition Week and throughout the year;

(3) salutes government employees for their unyielding dedication to and spirit for public service;

(4) honors those government employees who have given their lives in service to their country;

(5) calls upon a new generation to consider a career in public service as an honorable profession; and

(6) encourages efforts to promote public service careers at all levels of government.

SENATE RESOLUTION 100—COMMENDING AND CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM FOR WINNING ITS THIRD DIVISION I NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP, AND THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM FOR BEING RUNNER UP IN THE 2013 WOMEN'S DIVISION I NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION BASKETBALL TOURNAMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 100

Whereas, on April 8, 2013, the University of Louisville Cardinals defeated the University of Michigan Wolverines, 82 to 76, in the final game of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as “NCAA”) Division I Men's Basketball Tournament in Atlanta, Georgia;

Whereas the Louisville Cardinals have won 3 national titles and appeared in 10 NCAA Final Fours, their first title and third Final Four appearance under Coach Rick Pitino;

Whereas Hall of Fame Coach Rick Pitino is the only coach to win NCAA national men's basketball championships at 2 universities;

Whereas senior guard Peyton Siva has led the Cardinals to 2 Big East Conference Tournament Championships, 2 NCAA Final Fours, and 1 NCAA national title while playing for the University of Louisville men's basketball team;

Whereas junior center Gorgui Dieng was named Big East Conference Defensive Player of the Year and First Team All-Big East, along with junior guard Russ Smith;

Whereas junior forward Luke Hancock was named Most Outstanding Player of the 2013 NCAA Final Four, the first nonstarter to win the award;

Whereas each player, coach, athletic trainer, and staff member of the University of Louisville men's basketball team dedicated their season and tireless efforts to a successful team effort;

Whereas the University of Louisville women's basketball team inspired the people of the Commonwealth with its memorable and exciting run in the tournament and for being the lowest-seeded team to make it to the NCAA title game since the inaugural women's championship game in 1982;

Whereas residents of the City of Louisville and the Commonwealth of Kentucky and Cardinal fans worldwide are to be commended for their long-standing support, perseverance, and pride in this team; and

Whereas Coach Rick Pitino, Coach Jeff Walz, and the University Louisville Cardinals have brought pride and honor to the City of Louisville and the entire Commonwealth of Kentucky this season, which is rightly known as the college basketball capital of the world:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends and congratulates the University of Louisville Cardinals on its outstanding accomplishment; and

(2) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the president of the University of Louisville.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 716. Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. JOHANN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HELLER, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 717. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 718. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 719. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. VITTER, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 720. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 721. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 722. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 723. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 724. Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. COWAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID, of NV to the bill S. 649, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 716. Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. JOHANN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HELLER, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . STUDY; NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Department of Health and Human Services, jointly, shall undertake to enter into appropriate arrangements with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of—

(1) whether there is a connection between exposure to violent video games and harmful effects on children; and

(2) whether there is a connection between exposure to violent video programming and harmful effects on children.

(b) CONTENTS OF STUDY AND INVESTIGATION.—

(1) VIOLENT VIDEO GAMES.—The study and investigation under subsection (a) shall include—

(A) whether the exposure listed under subsection (a)(1)—

(i) causes children to act aggressively or causes other measurable harm to children;

(ii) has a disproportionately harmful effect on children already prone to aggressive behavior or on other identifiable groups of children; and

(iii) has a harmful effect that is distinguishable from any negative effects produced by other types of media;

(B) whether any harm identified under subparagraph (A)(i) has a direct and long-lasting impact on a child's well-being; and

(C) whether current or emerging characteristics of video games have a unique impact on children, considering in particular video games' interactive nature and the extraordinarily personal and vivid way violence might be portrayed in such video games.

(2) VIOLENT VIDEO PROGRAMMING.—The study and investigation under subsection (a) shall include—

(A) whether the exposure listed under subsection (a)(2)—

(i) causes children to act aggressively or causes other measurable harm to children;

(ii) has a disproportionately harmful effect on children already prone to aggressive behavior or on other identifiable groups of children; and

(iii) has a harmful effect that is distinguishable from any negative effects produced by other types of media; and

(B) whether any harm identified under subparagraph (A)(i) has a direct and long-lasting impact on a child's well-being.

(3) FUTURE RESEARCH.—The study and investigation under subsection (a) shall identify gaps in the current state of research which, if closed, could provide additional information regarding any causal connection—

(A) between exposure to violent video games and behavior; and

(B) between exposure to violent video programming and behavior.

(c) REPORT.—In entering into any arrangements with the National Academy of Sciences for conducting the study and investigation under this section, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Department of Health and Human Services shall request the National Academy of Sciences to submit, not later than 15 months after the date on which such arrangements are completed, a report on the results of the study and investigation to—

- (1) Congress;
- (2) the Federal Trade Commission;
- (3) the Federal Communications Commission; and
- (4) the Department of Health and Human Services.

SA 717. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROTECTING THE PRIVACY AND SAFETY OF LAW-ABIDING GUN OWNERS.

Section 1701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) PROTECTING THE PRIVACY OF LAW-ABIDING GUN OWNERS.—

“(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘private gun ownership data’ means information held by a State or unit of local government that concerns—

“(A) a license or permit of an individual to purchase, possess, or carry a firearm;

“(B) a license or permit of an individual relating to ammunition; or

“(C) the location of an individual gun owner.

“(2) WITHHOLDING FUNDS FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), and notwithstanding any other provision of this part, if a State or unit of local government receiving a grant under this part publicly releases private gun ownership data during any fiscal year, the Attorney General shall withhold 5 percent of the amount that would otherwise be provided to the State or unit of local government under this part for that fiscal year.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any release of private gun ownership data that is necessary in the course of—

“(i) a bonafide criminal investigation; or

“(ii) a trial, hearing, or other proceeding of any court, board, commission, or agency.

“(3) REDISTRIBUTION OF WITHHELD FUNDS.—On the first day of the first fiscal year after a fiscal year in which amounts were withheld from a State or unit of local government under paragraph (2), such amounts shall be made available to States and units of local government that do not publicly release private gun ownership data.”.

SA 718. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ANNUAL REPORT ON AMMUNITION.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “agency” has the meaning given the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Except as provided in subsection (c), not later than December 31, 2013, and before each December 31 thereafter, each agency shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) the number of firearms and types of firearms purchased or otherwise acquired by the agency during the previous fiscal year;

(2) the number of rounds of ammunition and the type of ammunition purchased by the agency during the previous fiscal year;

(3) the number of firearms owned by the agency that were stolen, lost, or unaccounted for during the previous fiscal year; and

(4) the number of firearms possessed by the agency at the end of the previous fiscal year.

(c) NATIONAL SECURITY EXCEPTION.—Subsection (b) shall not apply to the Department of Defense or the Central Intelligence Agency, if the Secretary of Defense or the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency—

(1) submits to Congress a detailed explanation of why reporting of the information described in subsection (b) would harm national security; and

(2) upon request, makes the information described in subsection (b) available to the relevant congressional oversight committees in a classified format.

SA 719. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. VITTER, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CONSTITUTIONAL CONCEALED CARRY RECIPROCITY ACT OF 2013.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Constitutional Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act of 2013”.

(b) **RECIPROCITY FOR THE CARRYING OF CERTAIN CONCEALED FIREARMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 926C the following:

“§ 926D. Reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any provision of the law of any State or political subdivision thereof to the contrary—

“(1) an individual who is not prohibited by Federal law from possessing, transporting, shipping, or receiving a firearm, and who is carrying a government-issued photographic identification document and a valid license or permit which is issued pursuant to the law of a State and which permits the individual to carry a concealed firearm, may possess or carry a concealed handgun (other than a machinegun or destructive device) that has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce in any State other than the State of residence of the individual that—

“(A) has a statute that allows residents of the State to obtain licenses or permits to carry concealed firearms; or

“(B) does not prohibit the carrying of concealed firearms by residents of the State for lawful purposes; and

“(2) an individual who is not prohibited by Federal law from possessing, transporting, shipping, or receiving a firearm, and who is carrying a government-issued photographic identification document and is entitled and not prohibited from carrying a concealed firearm in the State in which the individual resides otherwise than as described in paragraph (1), may possess or carry a concealed handgun (other than a machinegun or destructive device) that has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce in any State other than the State of residence of the individual that—

“(A) has a statute that allows residents of the State to obtain licenses or permits to carry concealed firearms; or

“(B) does not prohibit the carrying of concealed firearms by residents of the State for lawful purposes.

“(b) **CONDITIONS AND LIMITATIONS.**—The possession or carrying of a concealed handgun in a State under this section shall be subject to the same conditions and limitations, except as to eligibility to possess or carry, imposed by or under Federal or State law or the law of a political subdivision of a

State, that apply to the possession or carrying of a concealed handgun by residents of the State or political subdivision who are licensed by the State or political subdivision to do so, or not prohibited by the State from doing so.

“(c) **UNRESTRICTED LICENSE OR PERMIT.**—In a State that allows the issuing authority for licenses or permits to carry concealed firearms to impose restrictions on the carrying of firearms by individual holders of such licenses or permits, an individual carrying a concealed handgun under this section shall be permitted to carry a concealed handgun according to the same terms authorized by an unrestricted license of or permit issued to a resident of the State.

“(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preempt any provision of State law with respect to the issuance of licenses or permits to carry concealed firearms.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 926C the following:

“926D. Reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.”.

(3) **SEVERABILITY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if any provision of this section, or any amendment made by this section, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, this section and amendments made by this section and the application of such provision or amendment to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

(4) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 720. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title I, insert the following:

SEC. 114. CONDITIONS FOR TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONS AS ADJUDICATED MENTALLY INCOMPETENT FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 5511. Conditions for treatment of certain persons as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes

“In any case arising out of the administration by the Secretary of laws and benefits under this title, a person who is mentally incapacitated, deemed mentally incompetent, or experiencing an extended loss of consciousness shall not be considered adjudicated as a mental defective under subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18 without the order or finding of a judge, magistrate, or other judicial authority of competent jurisdiction that such person is a danger to himself or herself or others.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“5511. Conditions for treatment of certain persons as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes.”.

SA 721. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROTECTION OF PROSECUTORS, JUDGES, LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, AND THEIR FAMILIES.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Line of Duty Act of 2013”.

(b) **PROTECTION FOR PROSECUTORS AND JUDGES.**—

(1) **MODIFICATIONS TO THE COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES PROGRAM.**—Section 1701(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (16), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (17) as paragraph (18);

(C) by inserting after paragraph (16) the following:

“(18) to train and provide security details for prosecutors and judges, including their immediate families, involved in cases that raise substantial concerns of retaliation or intimidation through violent acts; and”; and

(D) in paragraph (18), as so redesignated, by striking “(16)” and inserting “(17)”.

(2) **MODIFICATIONS TO THE EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.**—Section 501(a)(1) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3751(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(H) Prosecutorial and judicial security details and programs.”.

(c) **JUSTICE FOR PROSECUTORS, JUDGES, LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, AND THEIR FAMILIES.**—

(1) **KILLING OF PROSECUTORS, JUDGES, AND LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.**—

(A) **OFFENSE.**—Chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1123. Killing of federally funded prosecutors, judges, and law enforcement officers

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

“(1) the terms ‘Federal law enforcement officer’ and ‘United States judge’ have the meanings given those terms in section 115;

“(2) the term ‘federally funded public safety officer’ means a public safety officer or judicial officer for a public agency that—

“(A) receives Federal financial assistance; and

“(B) is an agency of an entity that is a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or any territory or possession of the United States, an Indian tribe, or a unit of local government of that entity;

“(3) the term ‘firefighter’ includes an individual serving as an official recognized or designated member of a legally organized volunteer fire department and an officially recognized or designated public employee member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew;

“(4) the term ‘judicial officer’ means a judge or other officer or employee of a court,

including prosecutors, court security, pre-trial services officers, court reporters, and corrections, probation, and parole officers;

“(5) the term ‘law enforcement officer’ means an individual, with arrest powers, involved in crime or juvenile delinquency control or reduction or enforcement of the laws;

“(6) the term ‘public agency’ includes a court system, the National Guard of a State to the extent the personnel of that National Guard are not in Federal service, and the defense forces of a State authorized by section 109 of title 32; and

“(7) the term ‘public safety officer’ means an individual serving a public agency in an official capacity, as a law enforcement officer, as a firefighter, as a chaplain, or as a member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew.

“(b) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for any person to—

“(1) kill, or attempt or conspire to kill—

“(A) a United States judge;

“(B) a Federal law enforcement officer; or

“(C) a federally funded public safety officer while that officer is engaged in official duties, or on account of the performance of official duties; or

“(2) kill a former United States judge, Federal law enforcement officer, or federally funded public safety officer on account of the past performance of official duties.

“(c) PENALTY.—Any person that violates subsection (b) shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for any term of years not less than 30, or for life, or, if death results and the offender is prosecuted as a principal, may be sentenced to death.”.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1123. Killing of federally funded prosecutors, judges, and law enforcement officers.”.

(2) FUGITIVES FROM JUSTICE.—

(A) OFFENSE.—Chapter 49 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1075. Flight to avoid prosecution for killing prosecutors, judges, and law enforcement officials

“(a) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for any person to move or travel in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, under the laws of the place from which the person flees or under section 1114 or 1123, for a crime consisting of the killing, an attempted killing, or a conspiracy to kill a Federal judge or Federal law enforcement officer (as those terms are defined in section 115), or a federally funded public safety officer (as that term is defined in section 1123).

“(b) PENALTY.—Any person that violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for any term of years not less than 10, in addition to any other term of imprisonment for any other offense relating to the conduct described in subsection (a).”.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 49 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1075. Flight to avoid prosecution for killing prosecutors, judges, and law enforcement officials.”.

(3) AGGRAVATING FACTORS FOR HOMICIDE.—Section 3592(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (16) the following:

“(17) KILLING OF A PROSECUTOR, JUDGE, LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER, OR FIRST RESPONDER.—The defendant killed or attempted to kill a person who is authorized by law—

“(A) to engage in or supervise the prevention, detention, or investigation of any criminal violation of law;

“(B) to arrest, prosecute, or adjudicate an individual for any criminal violation of law; or

“(C) to be a firefighter or other first responder.”.

(4) FEDERAL REVIEW OF STATE CONVICTION FOR MURDER OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OR JUDGE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 2254 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j)(1) For an application for a writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court for a crime that involved the killing of a public safety officer (as that term is defined in section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b)) or judge, while the public safety officer or judge was engaged in the performance of official duties, or on account of the performance of official duties by or status as a public safety officer or judge of the public safety officer or judge—

“(A) the application shall be subject to the time limitations and other requirements under sections 2263, 2264, and 2266; and

“(B) the court shall not consider claims relating to sentencing that were adjudicated in a State court.

“(2) Sections 2251, 2262, and 2101 are the exclusive sources of authority for Federal courts to stay a sentence of death entered by a State court in a case described in paragraph (1).”.

(B) RULES.—Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts is amended by adding at the end the following: “Rule 60(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall not apply to a proceeding under these rules in a case that is described in section 2254(j) of title 28, United States Code.”.

(C) FINALITY OF DETERMINATION.—Section 2244(b)(3)(E) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking “the subject of a petition” and all that follows and inserting: “reheard in the court of appeals or reviewed by writ of certiorari.”.

(D) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—This paragraph and the amendments made by this paragraph shall apply to any case pending on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(ii) TIME LIMITS.—In a case pending on the date of enactment of this Act, if the amendments made by this paragraph impose a time limit for taking certain action, the period of which began before the date of enactment of this Act, the period of such time limit shall begin on the date of enactment of this Act.

(iii) EXCEPTION.—The amendments made by this paragraph shall not bar consideration under section 2266(b)(3)(B) of title 28, United States Code, of an amendment to an application for a writ of habeas corpus that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, if the amendment to the petition was adjudicated by the court prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) SPECIAL PENALTIES FOR ASSAULTING A FEDERAL PROSECUTOR, JUDGE, OR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 111 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 111. Assaulting or interfering with certain officers or employees

“(a) OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person to—

“(A) assault or interfere with an officer or employee described in section 1114, while such officer or employee is engaged in, or on

account of the performance of, official duties;

“(B) assault or interfere with an individual who formerly served as an officer or employee described in section 1114 on account of the performance of official duties; or

“(C) assault or interfere with an individual on account of the current or former status of the individual as an officer or employee described in section 1114.

“(2) PENALTY.—Any person who violates paragraph (1), shall be—

“(A) fined under this title;

“(B)(i) in the case of an interference or a simple assault, imprisoned for not more than 1 year;

“(ii) in the case of an assault involving actual physical contact or the intent to commit any other felony, imprisoned for not more than 10 years;

“(iii) in the case of an assault resulting in bodily injury, imprisoned for not more than 20 years; or

“(iv) in the case of an assault resulting in substantial bodily injury (as that term is defined in section 113), or if a dangerous weapon was used or possessed during and in relation to the offense (including a weapon intended to cause death or danger but that fails to do so by reason of a defective component), imprisoned for not more than 30 years; or

“(C) fined under subparagraph (A) and imprisoned under subparagraph (B).

“(b) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND JUDGES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) SUBSTANTIAL BODILY INJURY.—If the victim of an assault punishable under this section is a Federal law enforcement officer or a United States judge (as those terms are defined in section 115) and the assault resulted in substantial bodily injury (as that term is defined in section 113), the offender shall be punished by a fine under this title and imprisonment for not less 5 years nor more than 30 years; and

“(B) SERIOUS BODILY INJURY.—If the victim of an assault punishable under this section is a Federal law enforcement officer or a United States judge (as those terms are defined in section 115) and the assault resulted in serious bodily injury (as that term is defined in section 2119(2)), or a dangerous weapon was used or possessed during and in relation to the offense, the offender shall be punished by a fine under this title and imprisonment for any term of years not less than 10 or for life.

“(2) IMPOSITION OF PUNISHMENT.—Each punishment for criminal conduct described in this subsection shall be in addition to any other punishment for other criminal conduct during the same criminal episode.”.

(B) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 111 and inserting the following:

“111. Assaulting or interfering with certain officers or employees.”.

(6) SPECIAL PENALTIES FOR RETALIATING AGAINST A FEDERAL PROSECUTOR, JUDGE, OR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER BY MURDERING OR ASSAULTING A FAMILY MEMBER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 115 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c)(1) If an offense punishable under this section is committed with the intent to impede, intimidate, or interfere with a Federal law enforcement officer or a United States judge while that officer or judge is engaged in the performance of official duties, with

the intent to retaliate against that officer or judge or a person who formerly served as such an officer or judge on account of the performance of official duties, or with the intent to retaliate against an individual on account of the current or former status of the individual as such an officer or judge, the offender shall be punished—

“(A) in the case of murder, attempted murder, conspiracy to murder, or manslaughter, as provided in section 1114(1);

“(B) in the case of kidnapping, attempted kidnapping, or conspiracy to kidnap, as provided in section 1201(a);

“(C) in the case of an assault resulting in bodily injury or involving the use or possession of a dangerous weapon during and in relation to the offense, as provided for a comparable offense against a Federal law enforcement officer or United States judge under section 111; and

“(D) in the case of any other assault or threat, by a fine under this title and imprisonment for not more than 10 years.

“(2) Each punishment for criminal conduct described in this subsection shall be in addition to any other punishment for other criminal conduct during the same criminal episode.”.

(B) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) Section 119(b)(4) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 115(c)(2)” and inserting “section 115”.

(ii) Section 2237(e)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “in section 115(c)” and inserting “in section 115”.

(iii) Section 5(a) of the Act entitled “An Act to promote the development of Indian arts and crafts and to create a board to assist therein, and for other purposes” (25 U.S.C. 305d) is amended by striking “in section 115(c)” and inserting “in section 115”.

(d) SELF-DEFENSE RIGHTS FOR PROSECUTORS, JUDGES, AND LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 203 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3053 the following:

“§ 3054. Authority of judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement officers to carry firearms

“Subject to such regulations as the Attorney General shall prescribe regarding training and proficiency in the use of firearms, any officer, agent, or employee of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision thereof, who is authorized by law to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, prosecution, or adjudication of any violation of law may carry firearms. Such authority to carry firearms shall extend, but not be limited to presence within any building or structure classified as a Federal facility or Federal court facility, as those terms are defined under section 930, and any grounds appurtenant to such a facility, where such possession is otherwise authorized by law and incident to the lawful performance of the official duties of that person.”.

(2) CARRYING OF CONCEALED FIREARMS BY QUALIFIED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—Section 926B(e)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “any magazine and” after “includes”.

(3) CARRYING OF CONCEALED FIREARMS BY QUALIFIED RETIRED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—Section 926C(e)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “any magazine and” after “includes”.

(4) SCHOOL ZONES.—Section 922(q)(2)(B)(vi) title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, a qualified law enforcement officer (as defined in section 926B(c)), or a qualified retired law enforcement officer (as defined in section 926C(c))” before the semicolon.

(5) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall promulgate regulations allowing persons described in section 3054 of title 18, United States Code, to possess firearms in a manner described by that section. With respect to Federal justices, judges, bankruptcy judges, and magistrate judges, such regulations shall be prescribed after consultation with the Judicial Conference of the United States.

(6) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 203 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3053 the following:

“3054. Authority of judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement officers to carry firearms.”.

(e) LIMITATION ON DAMAGES INCURRED DURING COMMISSION OF A FELONY OR CRIME OF VIOLENCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1979 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1983) is amended by—

(A) striking “except that in any action” and all that follows through “relief was unavailable.” and inserting the following: “except that—

“(1) in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in the judicial capacity of that officer, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable; and

“(2) in any action seeking redress for any deprivation that was incurred in the course of, or as a result of, or is related to, conduct by the injured party that, more likely than not, constituted a felony or a crime of violence (as that term is defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code) (including any deprivation in the course of arrest or apprehension for, or the investigation, prosecution, or adjudication of, such an offense), a court may not award damages other than for necessary out-of-pocket expenditures and other monetary loss.”; and

(B) indenting the last sentence as an undesignated paragraph.

(2) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—Section 722(b) of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988(b)) is amended by striking “except that in any action” and all that follows and inserting the following: “except that—

“(1) in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in the judicial capacity of that officer, such officer shall not be held liable for any costs, including attorneys fees, unless such action was clearly in excess of the jurisdiction of that officer; and

“(2) in any action seeking redress for any deprivation that was incurred in the course of, or as a result of, or is related to, conduct by the injured party that, more likely than not, constituted a felony or a crime of violence (as that term is defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code) (including any deprivation in the course of arrest or apprehension for, or the investigation, prosecution, or adjudication of, such an offense), the court may not allow such party to recover attorney's fees.”.

(f) SELF-DEFENSE RIGHTS FOR FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL WORKERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 303 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 4049. Secure firearms storage for Federal correctional workers

“The Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall ensure that each Federal penal or correctional institution provides a secure firearms storage area for use by all persons employed by the Bureau of Prisons at the institution who are authorized to carry a firearm,

or allow such persons to store firearms in a vehicle lockbox approved by the Director.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 303 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“4049. Secure firearms storage for Federal correctional workers.”.

SA 722. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . HEALTH CARE SAFETY NET ENHANCEMENT.

(a) CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.—The constitutional authority upon which this section rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce, and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution Federal powers, as enumerated in section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

(b) PROTECTION FOR EMERGENCY AND RELATED SERVICES FURNISHED PURSUANT TO EMTALA.—Section 224(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 233(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking “An entity” and inserting “Subject to paragraph (6), an entity”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(6)(A) For purposes of this section—

“(i) an entity described in subparagraph (B) shall be considered to be an entity described in paragraph (4); and

“(ii) the provisions of this section shall apply to an entity described in subparagraph (B) in the same manner as such provisions apply to an entity described in paragraph (4), except that—

“(I) notwithstanding paragraph (1)(B), the deeming of any entity described in subparagraph (B), or of an officer, governing board member, employee, contractor, or on-call provider of such an entity, to be an employee of the Public Health Service for purposes of this section shall apply only with respect to items and services that are furnished to an individual pursuant to section 1867 of the Social Security Act and to post stabilization services (as defined in subparagraph (D)) furnished to such an individual;

“(II) nothing in paragraph (1)(D) shall be construed as preventing a physician or physician group described in subparagraph (B)(ii) from making the application referred to in such paragraph or as conditioning the deeming of a physician or physician group that makes such an application upon receipt by the Secretary of an application from the hospital or emergency department that employs or contracts with the physician or group, or enlists the physician or physician group as an on-call provider;

“(III) notwithstanding paragraph (3), this paragraph shall apply only with respect to causes of action arising from acts or omissions that occur on or after January 1, 2014;

“(IV) paragraph (5) shall not apply to a physician or physician group described in subparagraph (B)(ii);

“(V) the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary, shall make separate estimates under subsection (k)(1) with respect to entities described in subparagraph (B) and entities described in paragraph (4) (other

than those described in subparagraph (B)), and the Secretary shall establish separate funds under subsection (k)(2) with respect to such groups of entities, and any appropriations under this subsection for entities described in subparagraph (B) shall be separate from the amounts authorized by subsection (k)(2);

“(VI) notwithstanding subsection (k)(2), the amount of the fund established by the Secretary under such subsection with respect to entities described in subparagraph (B) may exceed a total of \$10,000,000 for a fiscal year; and

“(VII) subsection (m) shall not apply to entities described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) An entity described in this subparagraph is—

“(i) a hospital or an emergency department to which section 1867 of the Social Security Act applies; and

“(ii) a physician or physician group that is employed by, is under contract with, or is an on-call provider of such hospital or emergency department, to furnish items and services to individuals under such section.

“(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘on-call provider’ means a physician or physician group that—

“(i) has full, temporary, or locum tenens staff privileges at a hospital or emergency department to which section 1867 of the Social Security Act applies; and

“(ii) is not employed by or under contract with such hospital or emergency department, but agrees to be ready and available to provide services pursuant to section 1867 of the Social Security Act or post-stabilization services to individuals being treated in the hospital or emergency department with or without compensation from the hospital or emergency department.

“(D) For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘post stabilization services’ means, with respect to an individual who has been treated by an entity described in subparagraph (B) for purposes of complying with section 1867 of the Social Security Act, services that are—

“(i) related to the condition that was so treated; and

“(ii) provided after the individual is stabilized in order to maintain the stabilized condition or to improve or resolve the condition of the individual.

“(E)(i) Nothing in this paragraph (or in any other provision of this section as such provision applies to entities described in subparagraph (B) by operation of subparagraph (A)) shall be construed as authorizing or requiring the Secretary to make payments to such entities, the budget authority for which is not provided in advance by appropriation Acts.

“(ii) The Secretary shall limit the total amount of payments under this paragraph for a fiscal year to the total amount appropriated in advance by appropriation Acts for such purpose for such fiscal year. If the total amount of payments that would otherwise be made under this paragraph for a fiscal year exceeds such total amount appropriated, the Secretary shall take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that the total amount of payments under this paragraph for such fiscal year does not exceed such total amount appropriated.”

SA 723. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 649, to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for

other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH CONCEALED CARRY PERMITS.

(a) **FINDING.**—Congress finds that background checks under the national instant criminal background check system have proven to produce false positive results for individuals with similar names.

(b) **CONCEAL CARRY PERMITS.**—Section 922(s) of title 18, United States Code, as redesignated and amended by this Act, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting “is provided a covered conceal carry permit or license of such other person or” after “the licensee”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) In this subsection, the term ‘covered conceal carry permit or license’ means a permit or license issued by a State—

“(A) that authorizes an individual to carry a concealed firearm;

“(B) after conducting a criminal background check; and

“(C) not more than 5 years before the date of the applicable transfer.”

SA 724. Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. COWAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. Reid of NV to the bill S. 649, to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE IV—DENYING FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES TO DANGEROUS TERRORISTS

SECTION 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Denying Firearms and Explosives to Dangerous Terrorists Act of 2013”.

SEC. 402. GRANTING THE ATTORNEY GENERAL THE AUTHORITY TO DENY THE SALE, DELIVERY, OR TRANSFER OF A FIREARM OR THE ISSUANCE OF A FIREARMS OR EXPLOSIVES LICENSE OR PERMIT TO DANGEROUS TERRORISTS.

(a) **STANDARD FOR EXERCISING ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETION REGARDING TRANSFERRING FIREARMS OR ISSUING FIREARMS PERMITS TO DANGEROUS TERRORISTS.**—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after section 922 the following:

“§ 922A. Attorney General’s discretion to deny transfer of a firearm.

“The Attorney General may deny the transfer of a firearm under section 922(s)(1)(B)(ii) of this title if the Attorney General—

“(1) determines that the transferee is known (or appropriately suspected) to be or have been engaged in conduct constituting, in preparation for, in aid of, or related to terrorism, or providing material support or resources for terrorism; and

“(2) has a reasonable belief that the prospective transferee may use a firearm in connection with terrorism.

“§ 922B. Attorney General’s discretion regarding applicants for firearm permits which would qualify for the exemption provided under section 922(s)(3).

“The Attorney General may determine that—

“(1) an applicant for a firearm permit which would qualify for an exemption under section 922(s) is known (or appropriately suspected) to be or have been engaged in conduct constituting, in preparation for, in aid of, or related to terrorism, or providing material support or resources for terrorism; and

“(2) the Attorney General has a reasonable belief that the applicant may use a firearm in connection with terrorism.”;

(2) in section 921(a), by adding at the end the following:

“(36) The term ‘terrorism’ includes international terrorism and domestic terrorism, as defined in section 2331 of this title.

“(37) The term ‘material support or resources’ has the meaning given the term in section 2339A of this title.

“(38) The term ‘responsible person’ means an individual who has the power, directly or indirectly, to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of the applicant or licensee pertaining to firearms.”; and

(3) in the table of sections, by inserting after the item relating to section 922 the following:

“922A. Attorney General’s discretion to deny transfer of a firearm.

“922B. Attorney General’s discretion regarding applicants for firearm permits which would qualify for the exemption provided under section 922(s)(3).”.

(b) **EFFECT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY DENIAL THROUGH THE NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM (NICS) ON FIREARMS PERMITS.**—Section 922(s) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)(ii), by inserting “or State law, or that the Attorney General has determined to deny the transfer of a firearm pursuant to section 922A of this title” before the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, or if the Attorney General has not determined to deny the transfer of a firearm pursuant to section 922A of this title” after “or State law”;

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) in subclause (I), by striking “and” at the end; and

(II) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) was issued after a check of the system established pursuant to paragraph (1);”;

(ii) in clause (ii), by inserting “and” after the semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) the State issuing the permit agrees to deny the permit application if such other person is the subject of a determination by the Attorney General pursuant to section 922B of this title;”;

(4) in paragraph (4), by inserting “, or if the Attorney General has not determined to deny the transfer of a firearm pursuant to section 922A of this title” after “or State law”; and

(5) in paragraph (5), by inserting “, or if the Attorney General has determined to deny the transfer of a firearm pursuant to section 922A of this title” after “or State law”.

(c) **UNLAWFUL SALE OR DISPOSITION OF FIREARM BASED UPON ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY DENIAL.**—Section 922(d) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (10), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (11), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(12) has been the subject of a determination by the Attorney General under section 922A, 922B, 923(d)(3), or 923(e) of this title.”

(d) ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY DENIAL AS PROHIBITOR.—Section 922(g) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the comma at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

“(10) who has received actual notice of the Attorney General’s determination made under section 922A, 922B, 923(d)(3) or 923(e) of this title.”

(e) ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY DENIAL OF FEDERAL FIREARMS LICENSES.—Section 923(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “Any” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (3), any”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) The Attorney General may deny a license application if the Attorney General determines that the applicant (including any responsible person) is known (or appropriately suspected) to be or have been engaged in conduct constituting, in preparation for, in aid of, or related to terrorism, or providing material support or resources for terrorism, and the Attorney General has a reasonable belief that the applicant may use a firearm in connection with terrorism.”

(f) DISCRETIONARY REVOCATION OF FEDERAL FIREARMS LICENSES.—Section 923(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “(e)”; and

(2) by striking “revoke any license” and inserting the following: “revoke—

“(A) any license”; and

(3) by striking “. The Attorney General may, after notice and opportunity for hearing, revoke the license” and inserting the following: “; and

“(B) the license”; and

(4) by striking “. The Secretary’s action” and inserting the following: “; or

“(C) any license issued under this section if the Attorney General determines that the holder of such license (including any responsible person) is known (or appropriately suspected) to be or have been engaged in conduct constituting, in preparation for, in aid of, or related to terrorism or providing material support or resources for terrorism, and the Attorney General has a reasonable belief that the applicant may use a firearm in connection with terrorism.

“(2) The Attorney General’s action”.

(g) ATTORNEY GENERAL’S ABILITY TO WITHHOLD INFORMATION IN FIREARMS LICENSE DENIAL AND REVOCATION SUIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 923(f)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: “However, if the denial or revocation is pursuant to subsection (d)(3) or (e)(1)(C), any information upon which the Attorney General relied for this determination may be withheld from the petitioner, if the Attorney General determines that disclosure of the information would likely compromise national security.”

(2) SUMMARIES.—Section 923(f)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the third sentence the following: “With respect to any information withheld from the aggrieved party under paragraph (1), the United States may submit, and the court may rely upon, summaries or redacted versions of documents containing information the disclosure of which the Attorney

General has determined would likely compromise national security.”

(h) ATTORNEY GENERAL’S ABILITY TO WITHHOLD INFORMATION IN RELIEF FROM DISABILITIES LAWSUITS.—Section 925(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the third sentence the following: “If the person is subject to a disability under section 922(g)(10) of this title, any information which the Attorney General relied on for this determination may be withheld from the applicant if the Attorney General determines that disclosure of the information would likely compromise national security. In responding to the petition, the United States may submit, and the court may rely upon, summaries or redacted versions of documents containing information the disclosure of which the Attorney General has determined would likely compromise national security.”

(i) PENALTIES.—Section 924(k)(1) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the comma at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) constitutes an act of terrorism, or providing material support or resources for terrorism.”

(j) REMEDY FOR ERRONEOUS DENIAL OF FIREARM OR FIREARM PERMIT EXEMPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 925A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “**Remedy for erroneous denial of firearm**” and inserting “**Remedies**”; and

(B) by striking “Any person denied a firearm pursuant to subsection (s) or (t) of section 922” and inserting the following:

“(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), any person denied a firearm pursuant to section 922(s) or a firearm permit pursuant to a determination made under section 922B”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) In any case in which the Attorney General has denied the transfer of a firearm to a prospective transferee pursuant to section 922A of this title or has made a determination regarding a firearm permit applicant pursuant to section 922B of this title, an action challenging the determination may be brought against the United States. The petition shall be filed not later than 60 days after the petitioner has received actual notice of the Attorney General’s determination under section 922A or 922B of this title. The court shall sustain the Attorney General’s determination upon a showing by the United States by a preponderance of evidence that the Attorney General’s determination satisfied the requirements of section 922A or 922B, as the case may be. To make this showing, the United States may submit, and the court may rely upon, summaries or redacted versions of documents containing information the disclosure of which the Attorney General has determined would likely compromise national security. Upon request of the petitioner or the court’s own motion, the court may review the full, undisclosed documents ex parte and in camera. The court shall determine whether the summaries or redacted versions, as the case may be, are fair and accurate representations of the underlying documents. The court shall not consider the full, undisclosed documents in deciding whether the Attorney General’s determination satisfies the requirements of section 922A or 922B.”

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by

striking the item relating to section 925A and inserting the following:

“925A. Remedies.”

(k) PROVISION OF GROUNDS UNDERLYING INELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION BY THE NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM.—Section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)—

(A) by inserting “or the Attorney General has made a determination regarding an applicant for a firearm permit pursuant to section 922B of title 18, United States Code,” after “is ineligible to receive a firearm”; and

(B) by inserting “except any information for which the Attorney General has determined that disclosure would likely compromise national security,” after “reasons to the individual,”; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) the first sentence—

(i) by inserting “or if the Attorney General has made a determination pursuant to section 922A or 922B of title 18, United States Code,” after “or State law.”; and

(ii) by inserting “, except any information for which the Attorney General has determined that disclosure would likely compromise national security” before the period at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“Any petition for review of information withheld by the Attorney General under this subsection shall be made in accordance with section 925A of title 18, United States Code.”

(l) UNLAWFUL DISTRIBUTION OF EXPLOSIVES BASED UPON ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY DENIAL.—Section 842(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) has received actual notice of the Attorney General’s determination made pursuant to subsection (j) or (d)(1)(B) of section 843 of this title.”

(m) ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY DENIAL AS PROHIBITOR.—Section 842(i) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by inserting “; or” at the end; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) who has received actual notice of the Attorney General’s determination made pursuant to subsection (j) or (d)(1)(B) of section 843 of this title.”

(n) ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY DENIAL OF FEDERAL EXPLOSIVES LICENSES AND PERMITS.—Section 843 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “Upon” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (j), upon”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(j) The Attorney General may deny the issuance of a permit or license to an applicant if the Attorney General determines that the applicant or a responsible person or employee possessor thereof is known (or appropriately suspected) to be or have been engaged in conduct constituting, in preparation of, in aid of, or related to terrorism, or providing material support or resources for terrorism, and the Attorney General has a reasonable belief that the person may use explosives in connection with terrorism.”

(o) ATTORNEY GENERAL DISCRETIONARY REVOCATION OF FEDERAL EXPLOSIVES LICENSES AND PERMITS.—Section 843(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “(d)”; and

(2) by striking “if in the opinion” and inserting the following: “if—

“(A) in the opinion”; and

(3) by striking “. The Secretary’s action” and inserting the following: “; or

“(B) the Attorney General determines that the licensee or holder (or any responsible person or employee possessor thereof) is known (or appropriately suspected) to be or have been engaged in conduct constituting, in preparation for, in aid of, or related to terrorism, or providing material support or resources for terrorism, and that the Attorney General has a reasonable belief that the person may use explosives in connection with terrorism.

“(2) The Attorney General’s action”.

(p) ATTORNEY GENERAL’S ABILITY TO WITHHOLD INFORMATION IN EXPLOSIVES LICENSE AND PERMIT DENIAL AND REVOCATION SUITS.—Section 843(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting after the first sentence the following: “However, if the denial or revocation is based upon an Attorney General determination under subsection (j) or (d)(1)(B), any information which the Attorney General relied on for this determination may be withheld from the petitioner if the Attorney General determines that disclosure of the information would likely compromise national security.”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following: “In responding to any petition for review of a denial or revocation based upon an Attorney General determination under subsection (j) or (d)(1)(B), the United States may submit, and the court may rely upon, summaries or redacted versions of documents containing information the disclosure of which the Attorney General has determined would likely compromise national security.”.

(q) ABILITY TO WITHHOLD INFORMATION IN COMMUNICATIONS TO EMPLOYERS.—Section 843(h)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “or in subsection (j) of this section (on grounds of terrorism)” after “section 842(i)”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “or in subsection (j) of this section,” after “section 842(i)”;

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting “, except that any information that the Attorney General relied on for a determination pursuant to subsection (j) may be withheld if the Attorney General concludes that disclosure of the information would likely compromise national security” after “determination”.

(r) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—Section 101(a)(43)(E)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(43)(E)(ii)) is amended by striking “or (5)” and inserting “(5), or (10)”.

(s) GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall issue guidelines describing the circumstances under which the Attorney General will exercise the authority and make determinations under subsections (d)(1)(B) and (j) of section 843 and sections 922A and 922B of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this title.

(2) CONTENTS.—The guidelines issued under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) provide accountability and a basis for monitoring to ensure that the intended goals for, and expected results of, the grant of authority under subsections (d)(1)(B) and (j) of section 843 and sections 922A and 922B of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this title, are being achieved; and

(B) ensure that terrorist watch list records are used in a manner that safeguards privacy and civil liberties protections, in accordance with requirements outlined in Homeland Security Presidential Directive 11 (dated August 27, 2004).

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a business meeting has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The business meeting will be held on Thursday, April 18, 2013, at 9:45 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the business meeting is to consider the nomination of Dr. Ernest Moniz to be the Secretary of Energy.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224-7571 or Abigail Campbell at (202) 224-4905.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Thursday, April 18, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on the U.S. Department of Energy’s budget for fiscal year 2014.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510-6150, or by e-mail to lauren.goldschmidt@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Abigail Campbell at (202) 224-4905 or Lauren Goldschmidt at (202) 224-5488.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building. The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, “Aviation Safety: FAA’s Progress on Key Safety Initiatives.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate in order to conduct a hearing April 16, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room 215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Tax Fraud and Tax ID Theft: Moving Forward with Solutions.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2013, at 9:45 a.m., to hold an Africa Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, “Examining Ongoing Conflict in Eastern Congo.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2013, at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled “The Challenge of College Affordability: The Student Lens” on April 16, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY, AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition

Policy, and Consumer Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on April 16, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Oversight of the Enforcement of the Antitrust Laws."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would ask for unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to S. Res. 99, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 99) expressing the sense of the Senate that public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the United States during Public Service Recognition Week.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 99) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

COMMENDING AND CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE MEN AND WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAMS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 100, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 100) commending and congratulating the University of Louisville men's basketball for winning its third Division I National Collegiate Athletic Association championship, and the University of Louisville women's basketball team for being runner up in the 2013 Women's Division I National Collegiate Athletic Association Basketball Tournament.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 100) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 743

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand that S. 743, introduced earlier today by Senator ENZI, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 743) to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

RECESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:04 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 2:04 a.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. DURBIN).

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first before I get into the substance here tonight, on behalf of myself, Mr. MCCAIN,

the Presiding Officer, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BENNET and Mr. FLAKE, we are introducing comprehensive immigration reform. Bottom line, a lot of work went into this bill, and I want to thank all of the staffs who have been up until now allowing us to introduce this bill as we promised in this legislative day. We are undergirded by the fact that Americans will be fair, balanced, and filled with common sense for legal immigrants and the 11 million here living in the shadows, as long as they believe we will not have future waves of illegal immigration. I believe our bill meets that test.

So I would like to thank everybody, including the great floor staff who waited very late tonight. I would like to thank my friend, colleague, and roommate, Senator DURBIN, for staying up this late, and Leon Fresco, Stephanie Martz and all of our staffs who worked so hard on this great legislation whose voyage begins now.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 2013

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 17, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks the Senate resume consideration of S. 649, the gun safety legislation, under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. SCHUMER. There will be a series of up to 9 rollcall votes tomorrow around 4 p.m. in relation to amendments to the gun safety bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SCHUMER. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:06 a.m., adjourned until Wednesday, April 17, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.